E
T65
.B36

THE NAKED TRUTH

Class E 165
Book .B36

CHARLES H. BETTS

THE NAKED TRUTH

Vital Issues Before the Country Clearly Analyzed and Discussed

The Mask Stripped from Demagogues and the Facts Revealed—
The Heart and Brain of Humbug
Pierced by the Sword of Truth

Speech Delivered at Clyde, N. Y.,
November 2, 1912

BY
CHARLES H. BETTS
Editor of *The Lyons Republican*

PUBLISHED BY
THE LYONS REPUBLICAN COMPANY
LYONS, N. Y.

E 765
.E36

Copyright, 1913,
by
The Lyons Republican Company

By Transfer
JUL 31 1924

CURE FOR ROOSEVELTITIS

(Ontario County Journal, Canandaigua, N. Y.)

The thought, in January, of a series of articles on "The Naked Truth" almost makes one shiver, but if reading the series in which Charles H. Betts, of The Lyons Republican, disrobes his former friend Col. Roosevelt, one will need a fan rather than a heater. Mr. Betts has gone deeper into the by-ways and side-passages of Col. Roosevelt's inconsistencies than any other writer who has essayed the task. He is thorough and one must be convinced that he is truthful. But to us the most amazing, if not pathetic, feature of Roosevelt's recent public life has been the unshakability of the faith of his followers in his sincerity. Brother Betts' naked truth taken three times a day before meals is our final prescription for hopeless cases of Rooseveltitis.*

---

*This speech was printed in The Lyons Republican, running in several issues.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Votes for Women	9
Present Discontent	9
Chicago Contests	13
Washington *Times* Quoted	14
Colonel Roosevelt Quoted	15
New York *Times* Quoted	16
Committee's Vote on Contests	18
The Texas Case	20
The Indiana Case	21
New York *World* Quoted	22
Philadelphia *Inquirer* Quoted	23
The Washington Case	24
The California Case	25
The California Electors	29
Clark and Roosevelt	31
Roosevelt's Pledge	32
Canadian Reciprocity	35
The Tariff	39
The Farmer and the Tariff	45
Protection and the Workingman	47
Roosevelt and the Trusts	51
Roosevelt's Campaign Contributors	54
A Crooked Primary	61
An Attempt to Bribe a Delegate	63
Roosevelt as a Progressive	65
Taft as a Progressive	69
Woodrow Wilson	71
Job E. Hedges	71
William Sulzer	71
Oscar S. Straus	72
The Republican Party	75
Representative Government	77
The Constitution	85

INTRODUCTION

This address, entitled THE NAKED TRUTH, was delivered by Charles H. Betts, editor of *The Lyons Republican,* at Clyde, N. Y., Saturday evening, November 2d, 1912.

The address has been revised, corrected and extended and printed in this form at the request of many friends who read the instalments of the speech as printed in *The Lyons Republican* and who wrote the editor requesting him to print the address in a book so that it could be obtained by the public in a more permanent form.

In compliance with these requests this little book is presented to the public believing that it contains needed information relative to the vital issues which are now prominently before the country.

I believe that the people are honest, intelligent and patriotic and that they want to know the exact truth about all public men and public questions. The best time to present such truths to the people is when they are normal, when they are not excited in a political campaign and when passion and prejudice has subsided and reason, common sense and justice has assumed authority over the public mind.

CHARLES H. BETTS.

Lyons, N. Y., February 1, 1913

THE NAKED TRUTH

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:—

I am pleased to see so many ladies here tonight. I am glad to see the women take an interest in politics and public affairs, because it will not be long before they will enjoy with men political equality.

One of the main arguments advanced against extending the franchise to women is the one to the effect that because women cannot shoulder a musket and go to war, therefore they should not be given the ballot. It has occurred to me that it is quite as important to supply a soldier as to be one. It has occurred to me that if it were not for the women there would be no soldiers. It has occurred to me that every hero and every soldier who has ever stood in the line of battle was his mother's substitute.

We men have always prided ourselves upon the fact that man was created first and woman afterwards. I for one am mighty glad that Adam had a rib to spare. Let us admit that man was God's first thought and that woman was God's second thought, but let us also be candid and manly enough to admit that second thoughts are always the best.

We are living in a very large world, which is filled to overflowing with all kinds of conflicting theories and it is no easy task for any man to pick out the true from the false, the sound from the unsound. It requires patient study and investigation. There is, however, one thing of which we can all be assured and that is no one man has a corner on either wisdom or virtue. There is no monopoly in the republic of ideas—no trust in the world of morals.

The Present Discontent.

We have a flock of demagogues in this country who are going from place to place preaching the doctrine of discontent. The man who goes up and down the country preaching this doctrine and fanning the flames of passion, prejudice and class hatred and endeavoring to make the people dissatisfied with their lot in life, is not the friend of the people, but he is the enemy of his country and the foe of mankind.

Herbert Spencer says the more we improve our condition, the more discontented we become. He was a great philosopher and thought deeply and reflected sanely, a rare thing in these hysterical days, and he says that this is so, not only with the individual, but with incorporated humanity. A moment's consideration of the subject will clearly show that it is true.

The more we improve our condition, the more we prosper; the more we educate ourselves, the more cultured we become; the more we refine our tastes, the better things we want, and the more they cost. By constantly improving our condition, broadening our views, educating and civilizing ourselves, we advance to the point where our wants and needs multiply, our tastes and appetites become more exacting, and we require more and better things to satisfy them. From the organ we advance to the piano, and from the carriage to the automobile.

It sometimes happens with some of us and, indeed, with most of us, that our new wants and needs multiply faster than our incomes and this makes us discontented. But this discontent is not an evidence of our distress. It is an evidence of our improvement. We are not distressed, we are prosperous, we are advancing, and our discontent is an evidence of our progress and is the spur to further advancement.

No demagogue ever told you this. The reason is he wants your votes. He wants to capitalize your discontent and so he wants to create the thing that he wants to capitalize. He wants to make you believe that you are distressed. He wants to create in your minds dissatisfaction and discontent so that he can make you believe that the only way to obtain relief is to elect him to a public office. This is the aim of the office-seeking demagogue and it is time that you awakened to the situation.

One reason that these demagogues do not tell you the truth is because they want your votes and they are ready to tell you anything to obtain them. Another reason is the most of them do not know. They are ignorant of philosophy and statesmanship. They are so busy trying to obtain a public office that they have no time to study either philosophy or statesmanship. They read only the yellow journals and muck-raking magazines, including The Outlook.

They read these periodicals until their minds are filled with

undigested and indigestible "trash" and they finally become afflicted with that fatal malady known as mental dyspepsia. They are sick and they think that you are sick and so they proceed to prescribe for you political quack remedies from their own disordered minds.

The old Latin philosopher, Boethius, had this kind of political quack doctors in mind when he said:

> These are they who stifle the fruit-bearing harvest of reason with the barren briars of the passions; they free not the minds of men from disease, but accustom them thereto.

Despite the gloomy pictures painted by these noisy demagogues relative to your condition, you are not sick, you are well and prosperous. We are the most healthy, the most normal, the most moral, the most intelligent, the most civilized, the most prosperous, contented and happy people the sun has ever shone upon, and we have reached our highest stage of industrial development and material prosperity and our highest degree of contentment and happiness under the magnificent administration of that patient patriot and broad-minded statesman, William Howard Taft.

THE CHICAGO CONTESTS

I wish to invite your attention for a few moments to a vital issue in this campaign. It is a vital issue because upon the false charge that Col. Roosevelt was unfairly beaten out of the regular Republican nomination for president and that the delegates were stolen for President Taft, is based the whole third party movement. Wipe out this false charge and there does not exist the slightest excuse for the creation of the third party movement, because Col. Roosevelt himself was a Republican and tried to get the regular Republican nomination at Chicago and he remained a Republican up to the time he was rejected by the convention.

He went into the convention as a candidate, his delegates went into the convention and became a part of the convention and took part in its deliberations, and he was a candidate and was voted for in the convention after the present platform was adopted, and therefore he did not leave the convention on account of the platform, or on account of anything except the fact that he was not nominated himself, and the only reason he gives for not being nominated is that the delegates were stolen from him. This is a false charge and when this charge is proved to be false, there does not exist the slightest excuse for Mr. Roosevelt leaving the convention and creating a third party, and when he did so he became an ordinary bolter and apostate.

I propose to prove to you and prove it by Col. Roosevelt's own witnesses that the delegates were not stolen for President Taft, and Col. Roosevelt knows it just as well as I do. In the first place, on his own showing, on his own claim of delegates, he never had delegates enough to be nominated himself. If Taft had not been nominated Roosevelt could not have been nominated either, because he never had, allowing him everything he claimed, enough delegates to control the convention and nominate himself. No man could be unfairly beaten out of that which he never had an opportunity to obtain. Therefore, the only question is, was Taft honestly nominated?

I wish to call your attention to the fact that Col. Roosevelt entered the field openly as a candidate for president some time after

President Taft had expressed his willingness to accept a renomination and many conventions had already been held, especially in the southern states. These conventions were held before Mr. Roosevelt openly entered the field, although he had been secretly plotting for the nomination since his return from Europe. Some one hundred and fifty delegates had already been elected, mostly in southern states, when he entered the field, and he and his friends thought something must be done to deceive the people into the belief that he had a chance to be nominated, and so they sent agents into the southern states to put up fake and fraudulent contests against the Taft delegates which had already been elected.

This I will prove by Col. Roosevelt's own witnesses or rather his own backers. Mr. Frank A. Munsey, one of the leading financial backers and most influential supporters of Col. Roosevelt, is editor and proprietor of the Washington Times. When the national Republican committee met in Chicago to hear the contested cases and when the cases were presented before that committee, and day after day the fraudulent and trumped up contests instituted by Col. Roosevelt's friends were being thrown out and the Taft delegates were being seated, Mr. Munsey thought it was necessary to make some sort of an explanation of the situation, and so in the Washington Times of June 9, 1912, we find this statement:

> When the national committee met in Washington last December there were persistent rumors that Roosevelt might be a candidate. LaFollette was already in the field. * * * When Senator Dixon took charge of the campaign a tabulated showing of delegates selected to date would have looked hopelessly one sided. Moreover, a number of southern states had called their conventions for early dates and there was no chance to develop the real Roosevelt strength in the great northern states until later. For psychological effect, as a move in practical politics, it was necessary for the Roosevelt people to start contests on these early Taft selections in order that a tabulation of delegate strength could be put out that would show Roosevelt holding a good hand in the game. A table showing "Taft, 150; Roosevelt, 19; Contested, 0;" would not be very much calculated to inspire confidence, whereas, one showing "Taft, 23; Roosevelt, 19; Contested, 127," looked very different.
>
> That is the whole story of the large number of southern contests that were started early in the game. It was

> never expected that they would be taken very seriously. They served a **useful purpose** and now the national committee is deciding them in favor of Taft, in most cases **without real division.**—Washington Times, June 9, 1912.

Let me call your attention to the statement that for "psychological effect," and "as a move in practical politics," it was necessary to bring these contests "for a purpose," as stated by Mr. Munsey's paper. And what was the purpose? To deceive and mislead the people; to practice a fraud upon the public; to make the people believe that Roosevelt had more delegates than he did have and that Taft did not have as many delegates as he had. This was the purpose! The whole candidacy of Roosevelt started here with fraudulent, trumped up, dishonest contests, for the express purpose of practicing a fraud upon the public, and then they talk about honesty and morality. Ye Gods, what a spectacle!

Let me call your attention to another witness. I will now put on the stand Col. Theodore Roosevelt himself. When the national committee was hearing these contests and the Alabama case was disposed of and the reporters informed Col. Roosevelt of the result, he gave out an interview which was published in his partisan organ, the *Chicago Tribune,* on June 8, 1912, and this is what the *Chicago Tribune* says:

> **The Colonel showed the reporters a table of delegates he expected to be awarded on the Alabama list. It was shown that he had conceded 22 to President Taft and claimed only 2 for himself. "You see, I had not counted on anything except that one district," he said.—Chicago Tribune, June 8, 1912.**

I want to ask any intelligent, honest, fair-minded man this question: "If Roosevelt knew that only two delegates had been elected for him in Alabama why did he start 16 contests in that state?" Does he not in this statement admit that he started at least 14 fraudulent contests, knowing that he had no right to the delegates? He was simply trying to steal delegates by putting up a bluff and contesting Taft delegates which he knew were regularly and legally elected.

Does an honest man try to thus cheat his rival? Does an honest man put up fraudulent contests? And when he does so should his word be accepted by honest and intelligent people when he charges somebody else with committing the very fraud he tried

to commit? It is an old game to cry, "Stop, thief!" when you have the stolen goods in your hands or when you are trying to get them. This criminal practice is as old as larceny.

I wish to invite your attention to an editorial in the *New York Times,* one of the independent newspapers of this country, of high standing and influence and a newspaper that is supporting Gov. Wilson, the Democratic candidate for president. This paper cannot be charged with being a partisan of President Taft. I have already quoted how Munsey's paper admits that the Roosevelt contests were trumped up, fraudulent contests. I have also quoted Col. Roosevelt as admitting the same thing and now I want to put in evidence the editorial from the *New York Times,* printed two days after Mr. Roosevelt's admission and one day after Mr. Munsey's admission.

On June 10, 1912, in a leading editorial, the *New York Times* said:

UNSCRUPULOUS AND INCOMPETENT.

The hearings of the contest cases before the Republican National Committee disclose unmistakably a plot to buy the Presidency for Theodore Roosevelt. It has failed because of the utter incapacity of his miserable agents. Had their skill been equal to their, and his, unprincipled audacity, if instead of being wretched palterers in chicane and corruption they had been competent in crime, men thoroughly schooled in the higher branches of political villiany, the picture now presented to the eyes of the Nation in Chicago might have been very different. Mr. Roosevelt's buyers and herders of delegates and his organizers of contests were ill-chosen for their tasks. His contests fail, every one of them, and they are seen to be based on such brazen impostures that even his own friends and supporters in the committee are unable to conceal their weariness and disgust.

But the plot stands revealed. While Mr. Roosevelt was raising his audiences in the North to the pitch of frenzy, the silent workers in the South, with ample means for their campaign of conveying and converting, were everywhere astir. The crowd around the soap box in New Jersey yelled, the needy colored brother in Alabama or in Florida advanced to the proffered, well filled hand, and they called it a Nation in revolt against the bosses. But while the consenting beneficiary of these dirty doings complacently receives at Oyster Bay professors of social up-

> lift come to consult him about good works, the winnowers are at work in Chicago and the chaff his fuglemen have brought to the mill is scattered down the wind.
>
> The intention and design to buy the presidency have been made clear. It is but too clear, also, that had the plot succeeded, the chief person in interest would have taken the purchased nomination without a scruple. Is he not now prating about "theft" as he sees property upon which he had laid lawless hand confirmed to its rightful owner? But failure in crime does not exculpate. Intent is the essence in this case, and that is proved in the sight of all men. The adaptation of the means to the end was never more ludicrously miscalculated, but that is not even a palliation. It only adds contempt to reprobation. The country has never before seen a foray upon the Presidency undertaken with such unscrupulousness and such incapacity. Is it too much to hope that the amazing revelation may give some at least of the poor befooled people in revolt a truer view of the character of their great deliverer?—New York Times, June 10, 1912.

Is it not remarkable that Mr. Munsey, Col. Roosevelt and the *New York Times* all agree so perfectly upon the fact that Col. Roosevelt's candidacy was based upon faked and fraudulent contests? The editorial in the *New York Times* simply elaborates and confirms the testimony of Mr. Munsey and Col. Roosevelt upon this point. It will be observed that the editorial in the Times eight days before the Republican National Convention convened, speaking of Roosevelt, said:

> Is he not now prating about "Theft" as he sees property upon which he had laid lawless hands confirmed to its rightful owner? But failure in crime does not exculpate. Intent is the essence in this case, and that is proved in the sight of all men.

A fine start for a moral crusader? A splendid moral equipment for the champion of "social justice."

Permit me right here to call your attention to the fact that Ormsbey McHarg, who had charge of the preparation of the Roosevelt contests at Chicago, and Gov. Hadley, who led the fight for the contesting delegations in the convention for Roosevelt, and Gov. Dineen, who was one of Roosevelt's most prominent leaders at the Chicago convention, all of whom were in position to know the inside facts relative to all of these contests, after the convention

was over refused to follow Roosevelt on his false charge of "stolen delegates" and they all came out for President Taft and are now supporting him for re-election.

Is this not a significant fact? Are these Roosevelt leaders all "crooks" and "liars" and "robbers" too? If so, Roosevelt displayed mighty poor judgment in selecting them to conduct his fight at Chicago. If his judgment is so at fault, should he ask the American people to trust it any longer? Is it not a fair presumption that these men are all intelligent, honest and patriotic men, and being in a position to know the inside facts better than anyone else, better than Roosevelt himself, and realizing the fake and fraudulent nature of the Roosevelt contests, they refused to follow him out of the Republican party on the false charge that the delegates were stolen for President Taft? Has not this significant fact ever penetrated your minds, my good misguided Bull Moose friends?

Let me call your attention to the fact that 164 of the contests brought by Roosevelt were thrown out unanimously by the national committee. Roosevelt's friends brought 238 contests. Out of this number 164 of them were thrown out unanimously and only 72 were considered seriously even by Mr. Roosevelt's friends, and Governor Dineen has since stated that Roosevelt admitted that only 32 had any merit and that he asked him (Dineen) to draw a resolution including only 32 as contested delegates.

However that may be, the fact remains that out of these 72 contests 64 were decided either unanimously or by a viva voce vote by the national committee and only 9 had sufficient support by Roosevelt's friends to insure a roll call. And let me say right here that every member of this committee was a friend of Roosevelt, having been elected at the 1908 Republican Convention, which he controlled absolutely. The record of the committee's action is interesting. It is as follows:

Alabama—16 contested, 14 Taft, no roll call. 2 Taft, by a vote of 38 to 15.

Arizona—6 contested, no roll call. All Taft.

Arkansas—16 contested. 12 Taft, no roll call. 2 Taft, by a vote of 49 to 2. 2 Taft, by a vote of 42 to 10.

California—2 contested. Both Taft; by a vote of 37 to 16.

Florida—12 contested. No roll call. All Taft.

Georgia—28 contested. No roll call. All Taft.

Indiana—12 contested. 10 Taft, no roll call. 2 Taft, by a vote of 36 to 14.

Kentucky—18 contested. 8 Taft, no roll call. 4 Taft, by a vote of 38 to 11. 2 Taft, by a vote of 38 to 13. 2 Taft, by a vote of 35 to 17. Compromise Taft 1 and Roosevelt 1.

Louisiana—20 contested. 14 Taft, no roll call. 6 Taft, by a vote of 50 to 2.

Michigan—6 contested. No roll call. All Taft.

Mississippi—18 contested. No roll call. All Taft.

Missouri—18 contested. 10 Taft. No roll call. 8 Roosevelt. No roll call.

North Carolina—6 contested. No roll call. All Taft.

Oklahoma—2 contested. No roll call. Both Taft.

South Carolina—2 contested. No roll call. Both Taft.

Tennessee—8 contested. No roll call. All Taft.

Texas—30 contested. 26 Taft. No roll call. 4 Roosevelt. No roll call.

Virginia—20 contested. No roll call. All Taft.

Washington—14 contested. No roll call. All Taft.

District Columbia—2 contested. No roll call. All Taft.

The above record reveals in startling outlines the fake and fraudulent nature of the contests brought by Col. Roosevelt and his friends, and the record of the vote of the committee confirms the statements of Munsey in his paper, the statements of Roosevelt in the *Chicago Tribune* and the statements made in the editorial in the *New York Times* all above quoted. Let me also remind you that all of these committeemen not only were elected as the friends of Roosevelt at the 1908 convention but the committee tried out everyone of these contests under and in accordance with the rules and regulations adopted by that Roosevelt convention.

I wish to call your attention for just a very few moments to the four cases which you have heard the most about relative to these contests and these are the cases of Texas, Indiana, Washington and California. I will discuss them briefly, but will endeavor to make the real situation clear to your minds.

At this point in the discussion of this subject I want to say that I deeply regret that the harsh epithets "thief!" "robber!" and "pickpocket" have been injected into this campaign, but inasmuch as they have all been injected into it by the "inspired" leader of the Bull Moose party, in order to meet his charges I will be compelled to refer to them more or less, but I hope to be able to do so in language so delicate and refined that I will not in any way infringe

upon the exclusive patent of Colonel Roosevelt to the use of these epithets in his characteristically coarse and brutal style.

THE TEXAS CASE.

I will first take up the case of Texas. There are 245 counties in the state of Texas. In 146 counties there is a Republican party. There is a Republican organization and Republican primaries were held and Republican delegates were elected to the State Convention. Of these delegates Mr. Taft's friends had 90 and Mr. Roosevelt's friends had 62, giving Taft's friends a clear majority of the convention.

In 99 counties in the State of Texas there is no Republican party; there were no Republican primaries held and no Republican delegates were elected. But one man, Mr. Cecil Lyon, the national committeeman, who is a Roosevelt man and who believes in the sacred right of the people to rule, obtained proxies from individual federal office holders in these 99 counties. He wrote to a postmaster and asked him to give him his proxy for the county in which he resided; he wrote to another federal office holder and told him to give him his proxy for the county in which he resided, and so armed with these proxies, purely paper proxies, from these 99 counties where there is no Republican party, where there is no Republican organization, where no Republican primaries were held and where no Republican delegates were elected, Mr. Lyon went to the Texas State convention and with these paper proxies from 99 counties, undertook to control that state convention and elect the delegates to the national convention and the result was there were two conventions, as the regular Republican delegates would not submit to such a proposition.

When the case came up before the national Republican committee, that committee took the position that the regularly elected Republican delegates in the State of Texas should control the state convention and elect the delegates to the national convention and that such delegates should be seated.

The credentials committee took the same position and the Republican national convention endorsed the decision of both the national committee and the credentials committee and from the decision of the national Republican convention there is no appeal.

There is not an honest, fair-minded, intelligent citizen in this

country who can deny the fact that this case was decided upon right, justice and equity and that any other decision would have been an outrage upon the Republicans of Texas.

THE INDIANA CASE.

You will all remember when the Indiana State Convention was held to elect delegates to the national convention that the convention was controlled by President Taft's friends and the delegates at large were elected for the president.

Col. Roosevelt the next morning filled the first page of all the daily newspapers in the country with one of his characteristic, scathing denunciations of the Republicans of Indiana, declaring they had "robbed" him of the delegates at large; that the Taft delegates were "stolen," that the will of the people had been suppressed and that he had been "cheated" out of the delegates from that state.

This statement of Col. Roosevelt's was published all over the country and hundreds of thousands of innocent people who had reason to have confidence in the former President's integrity and reliability believed the story to be true. What was the result? When this contest came up before the national Republican committee and the evidence was presented and all the facts brought out, the committee unanimously decided in favor of seating the Taft delegates.

The control of the state convention hinged upon the vote in Marion county, in which the city of Indianapolis is located. They had a direct primary there and President Taft's friends carried the primary with a vote for Taft of 6,163, Roosevelt had only 1,480 votes. Roosevelt and his friends charged that there was fraud in the primary, but when the vote was taken by the national committee on this contest, both Senator Borah, one of Roosevelt's leaders at the Chicago Convention, and Frank B. Kellogg, the former Attorney General in his cabinet, voted to seat the Taft delegates and in doing so they explained their vote by declaring that there was not the slightest evidence of fraud.

The decision of the committee was unanimous. The statements which Col. Roosevelt sent out in the newspapers all over the country were declared by both President Taft's friends and by Roosevelt's friends on the committee, to be false by a unanimous

vote of that committee, and thereby they stamped this charge as a slander on the Republicans of Indiana.

It may be that Col. Roosevelt was deceived into believing that he was "robbed;" it may be that he was misinformed. Let us be charitable enough to believe that he was, but when he found out that his charge was false, that it was untrue, that it was a slander upon the Republicans of Indiana, if he were the honest man I once thought him to be, he would have announced to the public that he was mistaken in the charge, that it was a false charge, and if he were an honest man he would have recalled that slanderous statement with which he had deceived, misinformed and misled so many of his fellow countrymen.

This is a fair sample of the reckless, false and unreliable charges which have continually issued from Col. Roosevelt's lips. The people have been deceived, misled and "buncoed," and he and his friends, by the use of a newspaper bureau financed by the trusts, and by disappointed office seeking millionaires, have constantly been practicing a fraud upon the public.

In confirmation of this statement I wish to put into evidence an extract from a leading editorial in the New York *World*, printed July 29, 1912. It is as follows:

"STOLEN" DELEGATES.

By publishing a summary of the evidence in the contests before the Chicago Convention the Taft people furnish a convincing answer to Mr. Roosevelt's charge that he was deprived of the Republican nomination by theft. The facts are against him, but he is not making his campaign on facts.

The third-term candidate has so often and so violently accused his opponents of dishonesty as to arouse sympathy for himself as the innocent victim of bare-faced frauds. In a recent article in **The Outlook** on the Chicago convention Mr. Roosevelt used the words "fraud," "theft," "dishonesty" and "stealing" over fifty times in describing the action of the majority. His methods have been shrewdly calculated to prejudice the public mind against Mr. Taft, and to some extent they have produced the effect intended. But he does not present proofs. No statement of the evidence on which he bases his sweeping charges has appeared in print. * * *

Of the 238 Roosevelt contests 164 were frivolous or fraudulent, and were withdrawn or abandoned. Only 74

remained. The evidence in these cases and in some of the others was heard at great length by the Republican National committee and again by the credentials committee. * * *

Mr. Roosevelt never had a majority of the convention of rightfully elected delegates. His pretensions to such a majority are fraudulent. From the moment that he was forced to submit his contests to the test at Chicago, he encouraged his spokesmen, like Heney and Dixon, to shout "theft" and "fraud" and to create the popular impression that the nomination was stolen.—**New York World, July 29, 1912.**

I now wish to put into evidence a leading editorial from the Philadelphia *Inquirer,* showing how the Roosevelt campaign of fraud and falsehood was carried on. The *Inquirer* says:

FEEDING ON FALSEHOODS.

Mr. Roosevelt repeated to an Idaho audience his oft-told tale of how he was cheated out of the nomination at the Republican convention. It is characteristic of Roosevelt that he never goes into the details. He contents himself with making claims. He was cheated, and that is all there was to it. That is his wail. Everyone who says he wasn't cheated is a liar. And so on.

Well, he was not cheated. He was simply not permitted to cheat on his own account. He had conspired to steal that nomination after he had discovered that he could not win it by fair means. The bogus contests that he instituted weeks after regular conventions had been held were of the most contemptible sort. They were intended to deceive the people. They served their purpose. When his hand-made contesting delegates were repudiated, and usually by Roosevelt members of both the National Committee and the convention's own Committee on Credentials, he lifted his voice to cry fraud. **It was in his own claims that the real fraud lay.** We say it without reservation that in all of the history of the United States there has never appeared a candidate who has had so little honesty of motive, so little political decency back of his candidacy. Roosevelt has founded his bid for public support on trickery, treachery, deception, hypocrisy and attempted theft of delegates and of electors.

To put it briefly, Roosevelt is feeding the people on falsehoods. That sort of diet gets fearfully stale after awhile.—Philadelphia Inquirer.

THE WASHINGTON CASE

Let us now take up the Washington case. The control of the state convention in that state hinged upon King county, in which the city of Seattle is located. In the state of Washington, under the primary law, the county committee can select the delegates to the state convention which elects delegates to the national convention.

The county committee of King county had a meeting and delegated the power and authority to the executive committee to select such delegates. Afterwards the common council of the city of Seattle changed the districts in that city, making 131 additional precincts. The committee had another meeting and the chairman of the committee was a Roosevelt man, and at that meeting it was decided that the new additional committeemen could not be elected until the regular primary in September and that they must be elected by the party voters themselves. Afterwards the agents of the trusts, who were financing Col. Roosevelt's campaign, got to work, and the chairman of the committee got busy and called another meeting of the committee, and when the regular members of the committee met at the time and place designated in the call, they were confronted there by 131 men claiming to be new members of the committee.

The regular committeemen at once ascertained that the Roosevelt chairman, who, like Lyon of Texas, believes in the sacred right of the people to rule, without any authority of law and in violation of all decency and honor, had, himself, appointed 131 new members. He could just as well have appointed 500 new members. He had just as much right and authority to make a new committee from top to bottom as he had to appoint 131 new members. The regular committeemen refused to recognize these illegal appointments and the meeting broke up in disorder. The minority members on the regular committee, acting with the illegal appointees, then called an illegal primary without any warrant of law.

President Taft's friends and Senator La Follette's friends put advertisements in the newspapers warning all of their friends to stay away from the primary, as it was an illegal primary, and when the vote was cast, although there were between 75,000 and 100,000 Republican voters in the city, only 6,000 votes were cast

and they were practically all cast for Roosevelt. A few who did not see the notices straggled into the primary and voted for Taft and for La Follette and the next morning we read dispatches in the newspapers announcing that Roosevelt had carried Seattle by a vote of 10 to 1. Great achievement! Wonderful victory! And this is the way the "bunco" game was carried on.

When the state convention met in the state of Washington, these delegates, elected in an illegal primary, never presented their credentials to the regular convention at all, but went to another "bolting" convention and were admitted there. The regular state convention was controlled by President Taft's friends and they elected delegates to the national convention, and these delegates were seated by the Republican national committee, by the credentials committee and by the convention.

There never was anything to this contest any more than there was to the southern fraudulent contests, and all the proof any intelligent person needs on this subject is to be told that Gov. Wilson's friends in the state of Washington carried on the same kind of a primary that Col. Roosevelt's friends did and that when his delegates were presented to the Democratic national convention at Baltimore, they were thrown out of the Democratic convention upon precisely the same grounds and for precisely the same reasons that Col. Roosevelt's delegates were thrown out of the Chicago Republican convention, and Champ Clark's delegates, who were elected precisely as Taft's delegates were elected, were seated in the Baltimore convention.

Does any sane, intelligent, right-minded citizen believe for a moment that the Democratic national convention would have nominated Woodrow Wilson for president and at the same time would have thrown out his delegates from Washington if they had been legally and honestly elected to that convention? The statement of the case shows the absurdity of the proposition.

THE CALIFORNIA CASE

I wish now to call your attention to the California case, about which you have heard more than any other, and this is one of the clearest and plainest cases of them all. The Republican national committee met in December and issued the call for the Republican national convention. That call was issued in accordance with the

rules and regulations adopted by the Republican national convention of 1908, which convention was controlled by Col. Roosevelt and the call provided:

> **That in no state shall an election be so held as to prevent the delegates from any congressional district and their alternates being selected by the representative electors of the district.**

Thus it will be seen that the call provided that all the delegates to the Republican national convention must be elected by congressional districts and that the voters in each congressional district should elect such delegates. This has always been the rule of the Republican party, or at least for fifty years. This rule was reaffirmed by the convention controlled by Roosevelt in 1908.

After the national committee issued its call and this rule went into operation, there was no power on earth that could suspend it. There is no power on earth that could vitiate the call or change its provisions. Not even the Congress of the United States, not even the Supreme Court of the United States, could change or vitiate that rule. The only tribunal that had any jurisdiction over the rules and regulations put in operation by the committee was the next Republican national convention, which was to convene on the 18th of June, 1912.

Gov. Hiram Johnson of California, who wanted to carry his state for Roosevelt, conceived the idea that he would have a new primary law passed and so he called an extra session of the California legislature for that purpose. When the matter was up for consideration Johnson and the Roosevelt followers believed that some of the congressional districts might elect delegates for Taft and others might elect delegates for Senator La Follette, so out of the purity of their own hearts, the sanctity of their own minds and the hypocrisy of their whole beings, they conceived the idea of passing a primary law taking *out of the hands of* the voters in *each congressional district the right to elect their own representatives,* as provided by the Republican national convention, and instead have the delegates to the national convention elected by the whole state at large.

This action was taken for the express purpose of *cheating* and *robbing* both Taft and La Follette of any delegates that might be elected in any congressional district for them. If such a law was

on the statute books in this state, New York City would elect the delegates for us in this congressional district and we would have nothing to say about it. That is what Col. Roosevelt and Gov. Johnson calls the rule of the people—*their people.*

Senator Borah and other distinguished lawyers wrote Gov. Johnson at the time that if the delegates were elected in that manner they could not legally be admitted into the Republican convention, because the rules and regulations of the convention provided that they must be elected by congressional districts and that the people in each district should and must have the right to elect their own delegates. Gov. Johnson announced that he would defy the rules and regulations of the national convention and pass his primary law just the same, which he did.

When the contest from the fourth district of California came up for consideration, it brought up the whole question. It was admitted by every lawyer, who had any legal perception and common sense, that all delegates from the state of California could be excluded from the convention because they were not elected in accordance with the rules and regulations of that convention and the act which provided for their being elected in another way was passed after the rules and regulations had already gone into operation and the legislature that passed the act knew that those rules and regulations were in operation before it passed the law ignoring them.

Col. Roosevelt said in *The Outlook* that the national committee repudiated the primary law in the state of California. This statement of Col. Roosevelt's is *the exact opposite of the truth.* The state of California repudiated the rules and regulations of the national Republican convention—the Roosevelt convention of 1908. This is exactly what was done, but the state of California had no authority in the matter. If that state could repudiate the rules and regulations of the national Republican party, then any state could do it and every state could do it and no convention could be held at all. The statement of the proposition shows its absurdity.

Now what did the national committee do when this contest came up? The committee, recognizing the fact that technically it could throw out every delegate from the state of California, concluded to ascertain the will of the people in each congressional district in accordance with the rules and regulations of the convention

and seat the delegates elected by the voters of each congressional district. There were twenty-four delegates elected for Roosevelt and two for Taft. The twenty-four for Roosevelt could have been thrown out with the two for Taft and thereby Taft's friends could have gained twenty-two delegates in the convention, which they had a perfect right to do. But the committee said in effect, "We will waive this technical point and we will decide this case in accordance with right, justice and equity, and we will allow the will of the people to stand as expressed in the primaries in the congressional districts, in accordance with the rules and regulations of the Republican convention," and by doing this Col. Roosevelt got twenty-four delegates while President Taft got only two. This is all there is of the California case, about which you have heard so much.

Now I want to again call your attention to the fact that there were 164 contests brought by Col. Roosevelt and his friends which were unanimously thrown out by the committee, as fraudulent, trumped up contests. This narrowed the dispute down to 72, and Col. Roosevelt's friends charged Taft's friends with stealing the 72, after admitting that they tried to steal 164. Now the only dispute is about the 72. They admitted that they tried to steal 164 and I *submit* that if they would try to steal 164 they would also try to steal the other 72. They pleaded guilty on 164 counts in the indictment and this creates a presumption amounting to a certainty that they were guilty on the other 72 counts in the indictment. The presumption is against them, the evidence is against them, the facts are against them, and the decisions were all against them and they did not have a leg to stand upon.

Every one of the contests were tried out by three separate and distinct tribunals, every one of which had a legal and constituted authority to act. First, they were tried out by the national committee and decided by that committee; second, they were tried out by the credentials committee and decided by that committee, and in every case by a decisive vote, and then they were passed upon by the national Republican convention itself, which is the supreme council of the party and from whose decision there is no appeal.

This is all there is to the charge of stolen delegates. Col. Roosevelt and his friends admit that they tried to steal 164 and we admit that they tried to steal the other 72. When reduced to

the last analysis, Col. Roosevelt's friends, to hide their own shame, simply charged Taft's friends with the crime that they themselves tried to commit. Col. Roosevelt says, "Thou shalt not steal," and I say unto Theodore, "Thou shouldst not try to steal; and when detected, exposed and prevented, thou shouldst not *squeal.*"

When Col. Roosevelt and his delegates went into the Republican national convention, took part in its deliberations, became a part of the convention and staid in the convention until after the present platform was adopted, and he was voted for in that convention after the adoption of the platform, he was in honor bound and every one of his delegates was in honor bound to abide by the decision of that convention, the same as they would have expected President Taft's friends to abide by the decision of the convention had Col. Roosevelt been nominated, and when Col. Roosevelt "bolted" that convention he played the "baby act." There is no clearer case of playing the "baby act" in recorded history since Eve ate the apple and Adam played the "baby act" in the Garden of Eden.

THE CALIFORNIA ELECTORS

Right here I want to call your attention to the fact that Gov. Johnson of California has followed up his iniquitous primary law to its logical conclusion. He has disfranchised every Republican voter in the state of California. No Republican in the state of California, either man or woman, can vote for President Taft this year on a regular ticket, except by writing in the names of the electors, which is practically impossible. Gov. Johnson and his friends stole the Republican name in the state of California in the primaries, the case was taken to the courts and the courts of that state declared that the Johnson primary law disfranchised the Republicans of the state of California, and the judges from the bench denounced the law as an outrage, but said that inasmuch as it was the law and no constitutional question was involved, the courts had no jurisdiction in the matter.

And this Gov. Johnson is a candidate for vice-president on the so-called reform Progressive ticket, this man who has preached honesty and charged others with "stealing" and who has "stolen" the name of the Republican party, after becoming a traitor to that party. He has carried out his iniquitous purpose to disfranchise the

Republicans of his own state at the election, the same as he intended to disfranchise the electors in the congressional districts by not permitting them to select their own delegates to the Republican national convention.

And let me call your attention to the fact that Gov. Johnson's own father, a former congressman from that state, has come out and denounced the action of his son. His father declares that inasmuch as he has been disfranchised by this primary law, together with other Republicans, he will not vote for either Theodore Roosevelt or his son, Hiram Johnson, but that he will cast his vote for Woodrow Wilson. This is the verdict that Gov. Johnson's father has passed upon his son. I submit to you, my fellow citizens, that Gov. Johnson's father knows his son better than anybody else, and he has passed a verdict of condemnation upon him.

CLARK AND ROOSEVELT

I wish to call your attention to the difference between Speaker Champ Clark and Col. Roosevelt. If ever a man had a right to bolt a convention because he was unfairly beaten out of the nomination, that man is Speaker Clark. On several ballots he had a majority vote of the regularly elected delegates to the Democratic national convention at Baltimore.

While it takes a two-thirds vote under the Democratic party rule to nominate, yet never since that rule has been in operation, or at least for the past quarter of a century, has a Democratic convention failed or refused to nominate the man who succeeded in securing a majority of the votes of all the delegates regularly elected to the convention.

At the Democratic convention at Baltimore, however, notwithstanding the fact that Clark had a majority of the votes on several ballots, in violation of all party precedents, the convention refused to nominate him and nominated Woodrow Wilson. Did Speaker Clark bolt? Did he cry, "Thief! Robber! Pickpocket!" and slander the whole Democratic party? No! He was game; he was loyal. He is a patriotic, true-hearted and loyal Democrat and therefore he accepted the verdict of the Democratic convention and is doing everything in his power to help elect his rival for the nomination.

It takes a real man to do this. It takes a man who is really heroic, who really believes in the principles of his party and who does not place his own selfish ambition above the welfare and success of his party. Although he was defeated as no man had been defeated in a Democratic convention, Speaker Clark did not bolt his party. He did not slander the Democratic party and then try to destroy it, simply because some of the delegates deserted him at the critical time in the convention.

But how about Roosevelt? He was beaten, and fairly beaten, under the rules and regulations and the precedents which have obtained in his party since its foundation. He was beaten in accordance with the very rules and precedents confirmed by himself

in the Republican national convention of 1908, which he controlled. He was openly, honestly and regularly defeated in the Republican national convention and was denied a nomination which he gave the American people his solemn pledge he would not take, in the following emphatic words:

> **On the 4th day of March next I shall have served three and one-half years, and this three and one-half years constitutes my first term. The wise custom which limits the president to two terms regards the substance and not the form. Under no circumstances will I be a candidate for or accept another nomination."—Statement of Mr. Roosevelt, Nov. 8, 1904.**

After being denied a nomination which he thus pledged the American people he would not take, what did Roosevelt do? He bolted the Republican convention; he ran the assassin's dagger into the heart of his party. He created a new party for the express purpose of trying to destroy the Republican party, and he did this in every state. In one of his campaign speeches, while in a fit of mad frenzy, he said:

> **I will eat the vitals out of the Republican party.**

Think of the malignity of such party treason; think of the revengeful savagery of this disappointed demagogue. Schrank committed the dastardly crime of trying to assassinate Roosevelt. Roosevelt is committing the dastardly crime of trying to assassinate the Republican party,—the party that made him. Roosevelt, to gratify a malignant revenge, is politically trying to murder his mother, who nursed and carried him from obscurity to fame. By doing this he has already placed his name in history beside that of Judas and Benedict Arnold.

My fellow Republicans, let us pause for a moment to drop a tear of pity on the ruin wrought to a great reputation by inflated egotism and a demented ambition.

Right here I wish to utter a word of warning to the honest and sincere men and women, and especially to the clergy of this country, who are joining this third party movement on the theory that it is a movement for moral uplift and social justice. I want to say emphatically that no man whose mind is inspired by revenge, whose heart is black with malignity and whose soul is stained with unjustifiable party treason, can ever become the unselfish leader of

a moral crusade or the honest champion of social justice. Longinus says:

> The **bane** of true genius in the present day is that **dissolution of morals** which, with few exceptions, prevails among men, who, in all they do or undertake, **seek only applause and self-gratification,** without a thought of that public utility which cannot be too zealously pursued or too highly valued.

CANADIAN RECIPROCITY

I want to say a few words on the subject of Canadian reciprocity and I want to tell you exactly who is to blame for having that issue raised in this country. The American farmers were to blame for having this issue raised during the past two years.

After the Payne tariff bill was passed and signed by President Taft, which amply protected the farm products of the country, if the American farmers had elected a Republican House of Representatives you would never have heard of Canadian reciprocity. But when under the splendid administration of President Taft the American farmers were prospering as never before and they were so busy on the farm and so absorbed in money making under the beneficence of a protective policy, they forgot to go to the polls and vote for Republican congressmen, and they remained at home and allowed the Democratic electors to go to the polls and elect a Democratic Congress and by doing this they laid the foundation for the reciprocity agreement with Canada.

As soon as that verdict was pronounced at the polls, as soon as it was known that a Democratic House of Representatives had been elected, all the Democratic newspapers took advantage of the situation to declare that it was a repudiation of the Republican policy of protection and the Payne tariff law.

The insurgent Republicans of the West, who were looking for an opportunity to embarrass President Taft, took up the same issue. The newspapers which had entered into a conspiracy to write down the tariff law, because they were not allowed to have free print paper, also took up the question and started a ceaseless agitation in favor of a reduction of the tariff duties and they nearly all favored Canadian reciprocity.

President Taft, confronted with this situation, thought that if this was the verdict of the people, if the people had decided that the Republican protective policy was wrong, then tne only thing to do was to experiment with the other theory in as limited a degree as possible and with a country where it would do as little harm as possible. So he conceived the idea of experimenting with

reciprocity with Canada in order to satisfy the demands of the people, believing that such an agreement with Canada would do less harm to the American farmers than such an agreement with any other country, because the conditions in Canada and the United States are nearer identical than they are in any other country in the world.

President Taft, however, before making this Canadian agreement, submitted the whole proposition, including the details of the agreement, to Col. Theodore Roosevelt and asked for his judgment in regard to the same. Col. Roosevelt urged President Taft to take this step and make the reciprocity agreement with Canada, declaring in a personal letter to President Taft that he was not only in favor of reciprocity with Canada, but that he was in favor of *absolute free trade.*

This, in brief, is the history of the rise of the reciprocity issue and its fall occurred when it was rejected by Canada. If the American farmers had elected a Republican House of Representatives to sustain the protective policy as laid down in the Payne tariff law; if the American farmers had elected a Republican House of Representatives to sustain President Taft and his administration after he had signed the Payne tariff bill, which adequately protected their interests, there would never have arisen in this country the question of Canadian reciprocity. It was the negligence of the farmers in not performing their duty, in not supporting a Republican president and a Republican administration, which led to the Canadian reciprocity issue.

But however that may be, the issue is now dead. It was rejected by Canada and after it was rejected by Canada a Republican Senate voted to repeal the agreement, and all the votes against repeal were cast by Democrats and Roosevelt Progressives, and when it came over to the House Congressman Payne, from this district, moved three times to repeal the Canadian reciprocity agreement. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee he made this motion, which motion was opposed by Mr. Underwood, the Democratic leader, and every Democrat on the committee voted against it.

When the question of repealing Canadian reciprocity came up in the House, every Republican voted in favor of it the last time except two, and every Democrat in the House voted against repeal-

ing the Canadian reciprocity agreement except about six. The two parties have taken a direct stand upon this proposition, the Republican party for the repeal of Canadian reciprocity, and the Democratic party against it. Which party, my farmer friend, are you going to support?

If you are against Canadian reciprocity, how can you support the Democratic party? If you are against Canadian reciprocity, how are you going to support Col. Roosevelt, who declared that he is in favor not only of reciprocity with Canada, but *absolute free trade?"*

Not only this, but a vote for Roosevelt is half a vote for Wilson and is half a vote to carry into operation the Democratic free trade theory, not only with Canada, but with all the rest of the world.

Mr. Underwood, in his Farmers' Free List Bill, put all the products of the farm on the free list with all the world, but he made an exception in favor of rice, because it is raised in the southern states. Every Canadian newspaper is in favor of the election of Woodrow Wilson because they say that if the Democratic party wins, Canada will then have free trade with the United States without giving anything in return, as she would be obliged to do under a reciprocity agreement.

Not only this, but I wish to call your attention to the fact that the Republican national convention in its platform declares for equal protection to the American farmer, the American working man and American industries and that President Taft accepts the terms of that platform and stands upon it and is running as a candidate for re-election upon that platform, and therefore President Taft and the Republican party in this campaign stand for protection to the American farmer against Canada and every other country.

So, my farmer friend, the question narrows down to whether or not you are going to vote the Republican ticket and for protection and a continuance of prosperity or whether you are going to give a full vote for Wilson and free trade or a half vote for free trade by voting for Roosevelt.

THE TARIFF

The tariff question is one of the leading issues in this campaign, and you have probably heard a great deal of discussion on this subject. If every nation were the same, if every nation had the same civilization, the same standard of morals, the same standard of living, the same standard of wages and the conditions all over the world were exactly the same, then free trade would be the ideal theory. But in this world we have to frame our industrial theory to fit people as they exist and conditions as they are, and if our theory does not work out practically, and secure beneficial results, it is in fact no true theory at all, but is simply a phantom of the mind.

Col. Ingersoll once said:

All of the argument is in favor of free trade and all the facts are against it.

This is true. The arguments are in favor of the theory and the facts are all against its operation and I will tell you why. For instance, if we remove all the tariff duties and put our laboring men and manufacturers and our farmers in direct competition with all the world, we will not be able to improve the conditions of other nations, we will not be able to raise their standard of living, their standard of wages, we will not be able to elevate their morals or their civilization and lift them up to our level, but they will be able to *drag us down* to their level by compelling us to accept their conditions in order to compete with them. This is so simple that a child can understand it.

It is the duty of a nation first of all to protect its own people, to conserve their interests and build up and multiply and diversify their industries. Every nation, with this great object in view, should endeavor to possess within itself all the needs of national supply. These consist of the necessary means to supply sustenance, habitation, clothing and defense. The possession of these needs by home production, to the largest possible extent, is necessary to secure the perfection of the body politic, the welfare of society and the safety and independence of a nation.

We are all born into this world with certain talents and capa-

bilities, and nature has fixed upon every one of us a limit. Nature distributes her gifts with a secret and subtle hand and we can no more change nature's distribution of talents, wisdom and virtue, by law, than we can change her distribution of physical form and beauty.

We can, however, by industry, energy and diligence develop ourselves, up to the limit that nature has fixed upon us. Some of us have talent for one thing and some another. Nature has given all of us different talents and with this great diversity of talents we must have a diversity of industries to employ those talents to the end, that every person may seek and find the occupation for which his abilities best fit him, and thereby be enabled to reach the highest state of efficiency, make the most rapid progress in his work and be of the greatest benefit to himself, his family and society.

By this system opportunity is given to every individual to employ his talents in the field of their natural bent, and by doing this, he rises to the highest point of efficiency and citizenship that his energy, character and abilities can carry him. I wish to read you a paragraph on this subject as follows:

> When all the different kinds of industry obtain in a community, each individual can find his proper element, and can call into activity the whole vigor of his nature. And the community is benefited by the services of its representative members in the manner in which each can serve it with the most effect.

This is the philosophy of a protective tariff and these words were uttered by the man who first conceived of this policy and inaugurated it in this country, and he was one of the greatest creative and constructive statesmen the world has ever known,—Alexander Hamilton.

I wish to call your attention to the fact that every civilized nation with the single exception of England, has adopted a protective tariff and for the very reasons so clearly stated by Hamilton. The great German statesman, Bismarck, had the protective policy adopted by Germany and cited the growth, expansion, development and prosperity of the United States, as an evidence of its beneficent results. The greatest statesman of England in recent years, Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, urged this same policy upon that country

and was making great headway with its advocacy when he was taken ill and was unable to continue the fight.

George B. Curtis in his great work entitled "The Industrial Development of Nations," writing of the present drift of our free trade neighbor across the water, says:

> England, a mere speck on the map of the world, for one hundred years was the mistress of the world's commerce, and by all odds the most powerful nation of the globe; all because of her many and magnificent industries. It is worth while to note that, as she declines in power upon the sea and upon the land, her industries are also falling behind those of the United States and of Germany in their fertility and strength. She is going the way of Ancient Rome and from the same causes.

You have heard it stated by campaign orators that whenever this country has adopted a free trade policy its operation has always been followed by business bankruptcy, financial panic and industrial paralysis. This is true and I will tell you the reason. Because when the Democratic party obtains control of the government, the control and management of shaping the industrial policy of the country goes to the South. The Solid South is the Democratic party and the control of the politics of that party goes to the South, when the Democratic party wins.

Before the Civil War the Democratic party was the great constructive and conservative party, but when this country divided on the issue of preserving the Union by putting down secession, and on the other great issue of freeing the slaves, one a patriotic and the other a moral issue, these issues were the two great magnets which drew into the Republican party the best heart and brain of the country. Men of prominence who had always been Democrats and who were some of the leading statesmen of the North and West joined the Republican party upon these two issues and they have been with the Republican party ever since, and so have their descendants.

When the Republican party is in control of the government the industrial policy of the nation is shaped by the statesmen who live in the North and the West,—in the states which are normally Republican,—and these statesmen are familiar with the needs and requirements of our industries and our agricultural interests and

they frame and fit our industrial policy to suit our complex industrial conditions.

This is the reason that they are in favor of a protective tariff, to create a diversity of industries, to employ our diversity of talents to build up and develop business, which always results in prosperity, But when the Democratic party obtains control of the government and this control goes to the South and the policy is shaped by the southern statesmen, a sudden change for the worse always happens.

The reason is that the speaker of the House, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and the chairman of every important committee comes from the southern states, because the Solid South is the controlling factor in the Democratic party. When these statesmen shape our policy they always inaugurate the policy of free trade or tariff for revenue only. This is what they did in 1892, when Crisp of Georgia was speaker and Wilson of West Virginia was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and they enacted the Wilson tariff law. This year Champ Clark of Missouri is speaker and Oscar W. Underwood of Alabama is chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House.

If a Democratic House and a Democratic Senate is elected this year the industrial policy of the country will then be shaped by the southern statesmen who believe in free trade as declared for in the Democratic platforms of 1892 and 1912, both of which affirm that a protective tariff is unconstitutional.

If this happens you can look for the same conditions that prevailed under Cleveland's last administration and I will tell you why. The South is 100 years behind the North in industrial development and in improved farming. The southern statesmen are not acquainted with our needs and requirements and they are not in favor of a protective tariff which builds up and multiplies and diversifies our industries, because down there they do not need protection for any such purpose. They raise nothing in the South but Cotton, Cane and Hell.

Therefore, when our industrial policy is shaped by southern hands and by men who live in a section of the country one hundred years behind the industrial states of the North and West, by men who are ignorant of our needs and necessities, the result is that they pull the bottom out from under our industrial system and the

country suffers the calamity of business depression and industrial paralysis.

I want to say to my Democratic friends that you in the North and West are as honest and patriotic and as interested in the welfare and prosperity of your country, as are we Republicans, but you do not seem to understand that inherent and constitutional weakness of the Democratic party. When the Democratic party wins in the nation the control goes to the Solid South and you Democrats in the North and West are simply the tail to the Southern Democratic kite. The same condition obtains in the State of New York, when the Democratic party wins the control goes to Tammany Hall and the up-state Democrats are simply the tail of the Tammany Tiger. This is the reason that your party can never remain in power very long in the nation for the people of the North and West will not submit to having their industries destroyed by southern control. And the honest, intelligent and decent people of the state of New York will not for long submit to Tammany methods and domination. Therefore, if you win either in the state or nation, your stay in power will be brief. Your party will soon break and fall apart. The people will at the first opportunity call the Republican party back to power and we Republicans will march to victory over the prostrate form of the unfortunate and incompetent donkey.

I wish to call your attention to the fact that 1892 was the first time the Democrats obtained complete control of the government since the Civil War. Under Cleveland's first administration the Republicans had the Senate, and although the Democrats passed the Mills bill in the House they could not put their free trade theory in operation because it was blocked by a Republican Senate. It is a significant fact that for nineteen years previous to Cleveland's last administration there was an average surplus in the United States treasury of $68,000,000 and that as soon as the Wilson tariff law went into effect this surplus of $68,000,000 was wiped out and a deficit of $47,000,000 was created.

In addition to this Cleveland had to issue bonds to the amount of $262,000,000 to keep the machinery of the government in operation. The loss to the national treasury as a result of the enactment of the Wilson tariff law was more than $1,000,000,000, and President McKinley said that this loss of $1,000,000,000, together

with the shrinkage in farm values and in other property, including stocks and securities, made the enactment of the Wilson tariff law cost the American people as much as the entire cost of the Civil War.

Let me call your attention to the farmer's condition under Cleveland's administration and Taft's administration.

The average price of grain under Cleveland's administration and Taft's administration follows:

CLEVELAND AND TAFT PRICES COMPARED.

	Average price under Cleveland	Average price under Taft	Increased price per bu.	Per cent. of Increase under Taft
Corn	29.7	57.1	27.4	92
Barley	36.97	63.5	26.53	71
Wheat	63.03	91.8	28.5	45
Oats	23.	41.7	18.7	81
Rye	44.9	75.	30.1	67

If we take the highest and lowest prices of the farm products under the two administrations we find that according to Senator Smoot's figures given in his speech in the United States Senate on August 6, 1912, the advance from Cleveland to Taft is as follows:

ADVANCE FROM CLEVELAND TO TAFT.

	Per cent.
Corn advanced	200
Wheat advanced	67
Cotton advanced	28
Oats advanced	166
Rye advanced	137
Barley advanced	308
Hay advanced	138
Hops advanced	286
Potatoes advanced	282
Flax seed advanced	149
Fat cattle advanced	62
Fat hogs advanced	96
Dairy butter advanced	86
Eggs advanced	90

In reply to the statement of Woodrow Wilson that the farmers have to pay more for what they buy and that this equals the increase in their farm values and the increased price of their prod-

ucts, it is interesting to note what ten bushels of corn and twenty bushels of barley would purchase under Cleveland and under Taft, as shown by the following table:

PURCHASING VALUE.

	Pounds Sugar
Under Cleveland ten bushels of corn purchased.....	56
Under Taft ten bushels of corn purchase.....	123
	Bleached Sheeting
Under Cleveland ten bushels of corn purchased.....	13 yds.
Under Taft ten bushels of corn purchase.....	31 yds.
	Shoes
Under Cleveland ten bushels of corn purchased.....	1 pair
Under Taft ten bushels of corn purchase.....	2 pairs
	Pounds of Rice
Under Cleveland twenty bushels of barley purchased.	111
Under Taft twenty bushels of barley purchase.....	495
	Gallons of Molasses
Under Cleveland twenty bushels of barley purchased.	19
Under Taft twenty bushels of barley purchase.....	57

The same proportion of increased purchasing power holds good as to all the staple products of the farmers.

During the ten years, from 1900 to 1910, farm values in this country increased from $20,000,000,000 to $40,000,000,000, which is an increase of over 100% and the value of farm products increased at the same time from $4,000,000,000 to $8,000,000,000, which is an increase of $4,000,000,000 and is nearly another 100% increase as shown by the following tables:

INCREASE IN FARM VALUES.

1900.....	$20,439,901,164
1910.....	40,991,499,090
Increase in farm values.....	$20,551,547,926

This is an increase of 100.05 per cent.

INCREASE IN FARM PRODUCTS.

1900 farm products.....	$4,417,069,973
1910 farm products.....	8,694,000,000
Increase in farm products in ten years..	$4,276,930,027

The increase of 100.05 per cent. in farm values and the increase of nearly 100 per cent. in the value of farm products makes a total benefit to the farmer of 200 per cent. *My farmer friend, do you want a change?*

PROTECTION AND THE WORKINGMAN

The workingmen in this country are better housed, better fed, and better clothed and are more happy and contented than in any other country in the world, because they receive higher wages and are more prosperous than the workingmen of any other country.

The Bureau of Railway Economics in its report on the subject of wages in this country and others says:

> The average daily compensation of railway employees of all classes for the year 1910 was in the United States $2.23; in the United Kingdom, $1.05; excluding supplementary allowances negligibly affecting the average, it was in Prussia-Hesse 81 cents; and in Austria 89 cents. The lowest paid railway employee in the United States, the ordinary track-man, receives a greater compensation than many of the railway employees of France, even those of higher grades and with responsible duties. The compensation of railway employees is from two to three times as high in the United States as in Italy.

The difference in wages of the workingmen in America and in free trade England is shown by the following table:

AVERAGE DAILY EARNINGS.

Occupation	United States 1907-8	United Kingdom October, 1907
All occupations (except officers and clerks)	$2.19	$1.048
Station men, other than agents	1.82	0.90
Enginemen	4.45	1.86
Firemen	2.64	1.11
Conductors	3.81	1.23
Other trainmen	2.60	1.25
Machinists	2.95	1.285
Carpenters	2.40	1.285
Other Shopmen	2.12	0.88
Trackmen (other than section foremen)	1.45	0.89
Switch tenders, crossing tenders and watchmen	1.78	1.07
"All other employees and laborers"	1.97	0.99

The average daily earnings of railway employees in 1907 amounted to $2.19 in the United States and $1.048 in the United King-

dom, the earnings for the United States being 109 per cent. greater than for the United Kingdom.

For the separate occupation classes, the pay received in the United States is higher than the pay of the corresponding classes in the United Kingdom by the following percentages:

Occupation	Increased per cent.
Conductors	209.8
Enginemen	139.2
Firemen	137.8
Machinists	129.6
"Other trainmen"	108.0
"Other station men"	102.2
"All other employees"	90.0
Switch tenders, crossing tenders and watchmen	66.4
Trackmen (other than section foremen)	62.9

I wish to call the workingman's attention to the fact that Japan and China are now coming to the front as commercial and competing nations for the trade of the world and the labor conditions in these countries have a direct bearing upon the labor situation in this country at the present time. The official figures furnished the Ways and Means committee show that in Japan, the most progressive part of Asia, the following wages prevail:

Occupation	Wages per day	No. of hours
Brick layers	$.45	9-9½
Carpenters	.50	9-9½
Laborers	,35	9
Painters	.45	9½
Plumbers	.35	9
Stone cutters	.42½	9
Coal miners	.41	9
Coal mine laborers	.28	9
Compositors	.45	7
Farm laborers, male	.19	10
Farm laborers, female	.10½	10
Flint bottle makers	.51	9
Horse shoers	.28	8
Blowers, Bessemer process	.32½	10
Sawyers in lumber mills	.30	9

This list might be multiplied indefinitely, but I have given enough to show labor conditions in Japan. If the American manufacturer must compete directly with Japan, the only way that

he can do so is to produce as cheaply, and the only way he can produce as cheaply is to obtain his labor at the same low price. It requires no great intellect to comprehend this proposition.

In 1892, under President Harrison's administration, the country was more prosperous than it ever had been before, but the people decided that they wanted a change and they got it. Immediately after election, when Harrison had been defeated and Cleveland elected and a Democratic House and Senate were elected and the full control of the government was to be turned over to the Democratic party, President Harrison made a statement in which he said:

The lesson of one generation is lost on the next.

He said it had been so long since the people of the country had been educated in the school of adversity, which the Democratic free trade policy always produced, that they had forgotten its calamitous effects and they would have to experience these results again. He predicted that the inauguration of the Democratic policy of a tariff for revenue only would lead to business bankruptcy, industrial paralysis and universal distress. His prophecy was fulfilled.

Right here I wish to call your attention to the fact that every bright page in the history of this country, which has been written since the Civil War, was written by the hand of the Republican party and that the only dark page written in our history since that time was written by the hand of the Democratic party under Cleveland's last administration. As predicted by President Harrison, the enactment of the Wilson tariff law resulted in widespread business disaster.

More than 3,000,000 men out of employment, soup houses in every city, closed mills, silent factories, the wheels of toil standing idle, bank failures every day, the honest and industrious poor falling under the mercy of the money sharks, woe on every hand, wails from every quarter, all kinds of property, investments and securities slumping to the vanishing point, while the accumulated savings of a lifetime disappeared like the sun-touched dew.

This was the calamity brought upon the American people by the enactment of the Wilson free trade tariff law. There was no alleviation from this distress and these conditions until the people repented of their folly in "sack cloth and ashes" and prayed to the

"God who emancipated ancient Israel for a deliverance from the living death" and for a restoration of the industrial possibilities and opportunities from which they had so wantonly and so perversely turned away.

The answer to their prayers came in the election of a Republican Congress and a Republican President, William McKinley. Then followed an extra session of Congress, then followed the enactment of the Dingley tariff law on a protective basis, then followed the revival of business, the mills and factories were reopened, the fires were rekindled in the furnaces, the countless wheels of toil were again set in motion and from every factory in the land the smoke once again went circling up to the happy sky.

Then followed a rapid rise in the value of all kinds of property and securities, then followed the full dinner pail and the workingmen all employed at good wages, and from that time until the present, the pathway of the American people has been strewn with the flowers of popular comfort. Our industries multiplied and expanded, property and securities continued to increase in value, until today we are at the high tide of industrial development and national prosperity, and we have reached this high position under the protective policy of the Republican party and the splendid administration of William Howard Taft.

ROOSEVELT AND THE TRUSTS

We are living in a history making time. This is a progressive age. We have advanced so rapidly that we have just discovered that the only way to bust a trust is to "strike" it for a large campaign contribution. This is the new Roosevelt progressive way.

Colonel Roosevelt during his term as President of the United States posed before the country as the enemy of trusts. He was always denouncing the "malefactors of great wealth," and he fooled the American people into believing that he really was an enemy of the trusts. A careful examination of his record as President, however, reveals the startling fact that when he entered the White House there were in this country 149 big trusts and combinations and when he left the presidency and turned the government over to President Taft, there were in this country 10,020 big trusts and combinations.

When Roosevelt assumed the duties of President the 149 trusts and combinations had a capitalization of $3,000,000,000. When he left the President's office the 10,020 trusts and combinations had a capitalization of $31,000,000,000. If Washington was the father of his country, then Roosevelt is the father of trusts.

It is admitted that during his term as President Col. Roosevelt never lost an opportunity to denounce what he termed "bad trusts," but he declared at the same time that there were "good trusts." Nobody knew until recently what he meant by good trusts.

The revelations before the Senate investigating committee in regard to campaign contributions has thrown a new and luminous light upon this subject. The evidence before that committee revealed the fact that Col. Roosevelt's campaign collectors in 1904 "struck" the Standard Oil Company for a contribution of $100,000 and got it. Later when there was a stringency in the funds to conduct the campaign, they "struck" the Standard Oil Company for an additional $150,000. This trust refused to give the additional sum. It was told that it was making a mistake, and the events afterwards proved that it did, because immediately

after election, under the order of President Roosevelt, suit was brought against the Standard Oil Company and it was vigorously prosecuted. From the time it refused to contribute the needed $150,000 more it became a very "bad trust."

It was shown by the evidence before the Senate investigating committee that J. P. Morgan of the Steel Trust was asked for $100,000 and he contributed that amount. It was shown that Morgan was asked for an additional $50,000 and promptly "came across with the needful." What happened to Morgan? Was he prosecuted like the Standard Oil Company? Oh, no. His partner, Robert Bacon, who also contributed $10,000, was appointed by President Roosevelt, Secretary of State. He was afterwards appointed Minister to France. Herbert Satterlee, a son-in-law of Morgan, was appointed Assistant Secretary of the Navy, a position formerly held by Roosevelt himself. He has since been indicted by the Taft administration.

The Steel Trust, with Morgan at its head, was afterward allowed to absorb the Tennessee Coal & Iron Company and clean up a handsome profit of $60,000,000. The Steel Trust was also shielded from prosecution until President Taft pressed the suit against it. Yet Col. Roosevelt tells us on the stand before the Senate investigating committee that nobody ever received any favors on account of their contributions, and Roosevelt is not only an honorable man, but the creator of the Ananias Club, and its honored President.

George W. Perkins, indicted in the insurance scandal, the organizer of the Harvester Trust, the guiding genius of that institution, who is also prominently identified with the Steel Trust, contributed liberally to Roosevelt's campaign in 1904. The official record shows that he first contributed $100,000, next $25,000. Later he added $100,000 more, and then again he contributed $30,000, and still later $5,000 more, making a grand total of $260,000. Do you wonder that he is now Roosevelt's political manager?

What happened to Perkins? When President Roosevelt's Attorney-General started a suit against the Harvester Trust and Perkins served notice that if the administration was going to press the suit he would "fight," what was done? President Roosevelt called off the suit against the Harvester Trust, and yet Roosevelt

said on the stand before the Senate investigating committee that no contributors received any favors.

I wish to call your attention to the fact that the official list of contributors taken from the books of the late Cornelius N. Bliss, who was treasurer of the Republican National Committee in 1904, was produced before the Senate investigating committee by the assistant treasurer at the Western headquarters, Mr. Elmer Dover. I have this official list here in my hand, as it was published in the New York *Sun,* October 9th, 1912, and this list contains the names of all contributors of sums over $100.

This list shows that Archbold and Rogers contributed for the Standard Oil Company to the Roosevelt campaign fund of 1904 $100,000, precisely as charged by Judge Parker in 1904, and as sworn to by Archbold on the stand before the Senate investigating committee. It shows also that Morgan contributed $100,000, precisely as sworn to by Assistant Treasurer Sheldon, and as sworn to afterwards by Morgan himself.

It shows, as Morgan stated on the stand, that he later contributed $50,000 more, and on the list it is put down as follows:

J. P. Morgan & Co., additional, $50,000.

It also shows that W. Emlen Roosevelt contributed $50,000 and that other members of the Roosevelt family contributed. One item reads as follows:

T. Roosevelt & Sons, $500.

It also shows that George J. Gould contributed $100,000 exactly as sworn to by Assistant Treasurer Sheldon. This record further shows that Edward H. Harriman contributed $100,000 sometime before he collected and contributed the $250,000 "slush fund," which has been the subject of so much controversy. The additional $50,000 contributed by Morgan was a part of the Harriman "slush fund," so was the additional $50,000 contributed by Harriman, and the $50,000 contributed by Frick of the Steel Trust. James H. Hyde, of insurance scandal fame, "came across" at the same time with $25,000, having given $25,000 before, making a total of $50,000.

Another insurance magnate, John F. Dryden, just to give emphasis to social justice, chipped in $50,000. The Pennsylvania Railroad Company passed into Col. Roosevelt's "hat" two contributions of $25,000 each, making a total of $50,000. Other railroad

companies and other trusts poured out their contributions with a lavish hand.

In the interest of the truth of history and for the purpose of presenting to the people concrete evidence, I wish to present a list of the contributors to the Roosevelt campaign fund of 1904 copied from Treasurer Bliss's books and presented to the Senate investigating committee by Assistant Treasurer Elmer Dover, including those who contributed $100,000, $50,000, $30,000, $25,000, $20,000, $15,000 and $10,000. Those who contributed smaller sums I will omit. Many of the contributors on the list afterwards contributed smaller sums, but they are so insignificant in comparison with the larger ones that I will omit them. These contributions, however, will give the people a pretty accurate idea of how thoroughly and honestly Roosevelt was fighting the trusts.

The list is as follows:

George W. Perkins	$100,000
George J. Gould	100,000
E. H. Harriman	100,000
Standard Oil Co., per Archbold & Rogers	100,000
G. W. Perkins	100,000
J. P. Morgan & Co.	100,000
Chauncey M. Depew	100,000
John B. Claflin	50,000
Joseph Milbank	50,000
W. Emlen Roosevelt	50,000
Union League Club, Philadelphia	50,000
J. P. Morgan & Co., "Additional"	50,000
E. H. Harriman	50,000
H. C. Frick (Steel Trust)	50,000
C. S. Mellen, "Railroad"	50,000
H. J. Wainwright	50,000
G. W. Perkins	30,000
John F. Dryden	25,000
G. W. Perkins	25,000
James H. Hyde	25,000

(Some of the above last contributors made up the Harriman "slush fund" of $250,000.)

G. Von L. Meyer	25,000
S. F. Wainwright	25,000

Pennsylvania Railroad	$ 25,000
E. T. Stotesbury	25,000
Pennsylvania Railroad	25,000
S. J. Wainwright	25,000
E. T. Stotesbury	25,000
" " "	25,000
Robert Mather	25,000
James H. Hyde	25,000
John F. Dryden	25,000
R. C. Lake	25,000
E. T. Stotesbury	20,000
Roswell Miller	20,000
J. W. Meyer	20,000
S. J. Wainwright	20,000
International Harvester Co., per Richard Howes	20,000
E. T. Stotesbury	20,000
New Haven Railroad, per H. W. Kendall	20,000
James H. Scheff	16,000
Mark A. Hanna's family	15,000
James Speyer	10,000
Clarence H. MacKay	10,000
A. D. Juillard	10,000
Whitelaw Reid	10,000
J. W. Dryden	10,000
Andrew Carnegie	10,000
Adolph Lewisohn	10,000
J. Von L. Meyer	10,000
Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association	10,000
J. Von L. Meyer	10,000
" " " "	10,000
Whitelaw Reid	10,000
W. Blumenthal, for Senator Platt	10,000
J. Von L. Meyer	10,000
A. G. Smith, for Cuban Mail S. S. Co.	10,000
H. H. Roger (Standard Oil)	10,000
American Canning Co.	10,000
J. V. L. Meyer	10,000
Union League of Philadelphia	10,000
James Stillman	10,000

H. Mck. Twombey .....$ 10,000
E. T. Stotesbury 10,000
Whitelaw Reid 10,000
Robert Bacon (Morgan's partner) 10,000

The above figures show the friendly and intimate relations which Col. Roosevelt had with the "malefactors of great wealth," while feeding the people "sweetened wind" and denouncing the trusts.

George B. Cortelyou, who was formerly private secretary to Col. Roosevelt and who was at the head of the Bureau of Corporations and had access to all their secrets, was made chairman of the Republican National Committee. Like the southern contests started by Roosevelt against the Taft delegates, he was put at the head of the committee

"for psychological effect and as a move in practical politics."

He was placed there to "fry the fat" out of the corporations whose secrets he held in the hollow of his hand. The list shows that he made good. His chief must have been "dee-lighted."

The evidence before the Senate investigating committee and the official list of contributors presented by Assistant Secretary Dover, all confirm the sworn testimony of Morgan, of Archbold, of Sheldon, of Odell and of the other witnesses. Judge Duell, who was Roosevelt's primary campaign manager in New York, also swore on the stand that he knew about the Standard Oil contribution of $100,000.

An examination of the evidence before the committee and an examination of the documents there presented shows clearly that all the oral testimony and the documentary evidence agree with and confirm all of the statements made by Harriman in his letters, by Gov. Odell on the stand, by Judge Parker in his campaign speeches and by the other witnesses relative to the trust contributions to the Roosevelt campaign fund of 1904. *The single exception is the testimony of Roosevelt himself.*

The only way Roosevelt attempts to escape is by claiming that he did not know that the contributions were made. (Lorimer said the same thing.) What an innocent and ignorant man for such a wide-awake and brilliant citizen! This is the first time in Roosevelt's history that he ever admitted that he did not know everything. If Col. Roosevelt was so innocent and so ignorant as he

pretends to be, if all these hundreds of thousands of dollars were being tossed into his campaign fund to corrupt the electorate and purchase for him the presidency and he knew nothing about it, then he is too ignorant and too unsophisticated to again be trusted with the presidency. If he should be elected President again it would be entirely within the bounds of possibility for these great trusts and corporations to buy up the whole government and run away with it while he was not looking.

It will be remembered that in Harriman's now famous letter, written to his friend Webster, which was a confidential communication to a personal friend, never intended for the public, which letter, therefore, told the absolute truth, Harriman referring to his "slush fund" of $250,000, declared that it

> Turned 50,000 votes in the State of New York alone, making a difference of 100,000 votes in the general result."

In this connection I wish to say that Col. Roosevelt on the stump has repeatedly declared that both of the old parties have become corrupt and that it was necessary to organize his so-called Progressive party, more commonly known as the "Bull Moose" party, in order to purify the political situation. This campaign slogan is echoed all over the country from the stump by his public speakers with a sort of religious frenzy.

If it is necessary to purify our politics, and God knows that it is, after the revelations before the Senate investigating committee, relative to the Roosevelt corruption fund in 1904, if politics are to be reformed and society is to be regenerated, if an era of social justice is to be ushered in, it would hardly seem the proper thing to select Roosevelt as the head of such a movement for the purification of politics and the regeneration of society, because he is the very individual who was the head center and the beneficiary of the greatest carnival of political corruption which has been revealed in this country since the foundation of the republic.

No candidate for the presidency in all our history received so many and so large contributions from wicked corporations as did Col. Roosevelt in 1904. *But this is only half the story.* During his campaign for the presidential nomination on the Republican ticket, this year, there was another carnival of corruption equal to that of 1904, and in many respects its superior. It is safe to say that never in the history of this country has there been expended

such a corruption fund for any man for a nomination to the office of President, as was expended in behalf of Col. Roosevelt this year in a vain effort to buy for him the regular Republican nomination for President.

At the recent hearing before the Senate investigating committee there was some startling evidence. Dan R. Hanna of Ohio, indicted by the Taft administration, swore on the stand that he alone contributed to Roosevelt's primary fund in that state the sum of $177,000. Bill Flinn, of grafting contract fame, swore on the stand that he contributed for the same purpose in the state of Pennsylvania the enormous sum of $144,000.

George W. Perkins, indicted in the insurance scandal, who contributed so liberally to the campaign in 1904, swore on the stand that he contributed the sum of $122,000; Frank A. Munsey of the magazine trust, who objects to paying the postage on his magazines and wants the people to pay it for him, swore on the stand that he contributed $118,000; Thomas W. Lawson, of muck-raking fame, is said to have contributed something like $200,000, to say nothing of the countless other contributions by trust magnates and indicted millionaires.

It is generally conceded that $3,000,000 was expended in a vain effort to buy for Roosevelt the regular Republican nomination for President, and right here I want to say that the greatest tribute to the integrity, the intelligence, the honesty and the virtue of the Republican party and to its patriotism in all its history, is the fact that it refused to sell the nomination to this political adventurer. It is a matter of common knowledge that no such amount of money was ever expended by the friends of any candidate of any party in this country for a presidential nomination as was expended for Col. Roosevelt in his efforts to secure the regular Republican nomination.

No other candidate ever had such a large fund expended for him while making a canvass for this, the highest and most dignified office within the gift of the American people. The candidacy of Roosevelt with its enormous corruption fund contributed by trust magnates, money sharks and indicted millionaires, is a nation-wide scandal and a burning disgrace.

Every avenue of venality was explored, every mercenary elector and delegate, both black and white, were sought out and seduced,

every wicked political scheme which cunning could invent, hypocrisy approve and dishonesty carry into effect was resorted to in behalf of this social, moral and political imposter, who in this campaign has become the willing "tool of the trusts" to defeat and punish a Republican President because he has dared to enforce the anti-trust law and indict the money sharks, who are plundering the people.

No such carnival of political corruption has ever before been witnessed in any country since the fall of Rome. It was Burke who tells us:

> So was Rome destroyed by the disorders of continual elections, though those of Rome were sober disorders. They had nothing but faction, bribery, bread, and stage plays to debauch them. We have the inflammation of liquor superadded, a fury hotter than any of them. There the contest was only between citizens and citizens, yet Rome was destroyed by the frequency and charge of elections and monstrous expense of an unremitted courtship to the people.

I wish right here to answer one of the favorite arguments of Col. Roosevelt and his advocates and that is the one to the effect that he entered upon his candidacy in response to an "overwhelming public demand." Everybody who will take time to think will remember that when he first announced his candidacy it "fell flat." State after state was carried against him and public sentiment was fast crystallizing in favor of President Taft.

Roosevelt's opposition to Taft was one of the President's chief elements of strength. La Follette had beaten Roosevelt in Dakota; the situation was growing desperate. At this critical point the Steel Trust, the Harvester Trust and the millionaires who had been indicted by the Taft administration opened their "barrels." The first "dumped" their money into the State of Illinois, which is a Steel Trust state and which was never a progressive state. What happened? They succeeded in carrying the primaries for the third term candidate. They did the same thing in the State of Pennsylvania, which has never been a progressive state, and which is also a Steel Trust state. They did the same thing in the State of New Jersey, which is another Steel Trust state and which never has been a progressive state. They did the same thing in the State of Massachusetts, which is a con-

servative state, but their success in that state was more limited because it was not under the domination of the Steel or Harvester trusts.

I wish to call your attention right here to the fact that in all the primaries throughout the country Col. Roosevelt carried but a very few Republican primaries. He and his friends have talked loudly about how he swept the primaries, but what primaries did he sweep? Certainly not Republican primaries, but general primaries, in which all classes of voters were permitted to vote. With an immense corruption fund contributed by trusts and millionaires, he carried the primaries by securing the support of the "floaters" of all political parties. The "floaters" of all parties when they are arraigned on one side with the trusts' "sugar barrel" for bait can easily carry any primary. It is quite another thing, however, to carry a clean Republican primary, where only Republicans are permitted to vote.

It was Taft who carried the Republican primaries and Roosevelt who carried the general primaries under that sanctified presidential preference primary, which were designed to open the door for the use of the money contributed by the "interests" which were so potent, though "invisible," during Roosevelt's administration, but which influence was *made visible* by the investigation before the Senate investigating committee by the showing up of their enormous campaign contributions.

Col. Roosevelt is a very cunning politician and the cleverest demagogue of any age. He laid his plans with great care and executed them with consummate skill. First the agents of the trusts, working through the discarded and discredited political bosses, made a canvass in every county in the states where primaries were being held, paid out their money, made their arrangements to buy up the primaries and after the plans were all carefully laid and the situation was "cinched" to "rake in the floaters" of all parties. Then the heroic Colonel would rush into the state a day or two before the primaries and make a few fiery speeches and fill the air with noise, denunciation and eloquence. Then when the primary was over and the "floaters" had been delivered to the moral reformer, he and his friends would announce with joyous acclamations that it was another uprising of the people which demonstrated the great personal popularity of the third term candidate.

This was the finest "bunco game" ever worked on the American people and on the Republican party, but it did not succeed; it was blocked by the courage, intelligence and patriotism of the Republican delegates at Chicago. In regard to how the Roosevelt primaries were carried and in respect to the methods used I wish to quote a leading editorial in the New York *World,* as follows:

A CROOKED PRIMARY.

"If you are a Democrat and wish to vote for Roosevelt or Taft, you can do so unless now enrolled as a Democrat."

This information was circulated throughout Massachusetts Sunday by a newspaper owned by Frank A. Munsey, who is helping to finance the Roosevelt third-term campaign.

"Remember, you don't have to be enrolled in any party to vote at this primary."

This information was circulated throughout Massachusetts in the form of paid advertisements in the leading newspapers, the advertisements being signed by the "Massachusetts Roosevelt Committee."

Boston is a Democratic city. In 1904 Parker had 8,000 plurality over Roosevelt in Suffolk County. In 1908 Taft carried it by 2,500 over Bryan, but the Democratic candidate for Governor had a plurality of more than 10,000 over Draper. In 1911 Foss's plurality over Frothingham in the county was nearly 22,000.

Nevertheless, the Republican vote in the Republican primaries in Boston yesterday exceeded the Democratic vote by approximately 9,000.

How much of this discrepancy was due to Democratic indifference? How much to Democratic participation in the Republican primaries at the urgent invitation of the Roosevelt managers?

Of what moral or political or legal value is a Republican primary in which Democrats can vote, or a Democratic primary in which Republicans can vote?—New York World.

Not only Democrats, but Socialists, Anarchists, Prohibitionists and men of all parties and men of no parties voted in these primaries.

Notwithstanding all these crooked and corrupt primaries, notwithstanding all the "trust tainted" money contributed to buy the Republican nomination for Roosevelt, notwithstanding the fact

that nearly all of the money expended was contributed by indicted trust magnates and millionaires, who were either indicted by the Taft administration or had been previously indicted for violating the law, yet we are told that this new third party movement is a sort of a religious movement, and Col. Roosevelt himself tells us that as its leader he is fighting with "The Army of the Lord at Armageddon."

Was there ever such sacrilege in a civilized nation? Was there ever such effrontery? Was there ever such an insult to religion? The army of the Lord has never yet been led by pledge-breaking, affidavit-repudiating commanders and indicted generals.

No, my good Bull Moose friends, do not deceive yourselves, you are not fighting the battle of the Lord at Armageddon or anywhere else. You are fighting the battle of the most cunning, the most unscrupulous and the most dangerous demagogue who has ever annoyed and afflicted an enlightened and civilized nation, with a dictator's ambition, since Caesar reigned and Napoleon fell.

I have proved by unanswerable and unimpeachable evidence that Col. Roosevelt and his friends through the instrumentality of fraudulent, trumped-up contests tried to steal control of the Republican Convention and therefore they tried to steal the nomination for Col. Roosevelt. I have already quoted a leading editorial from the New York *Times,* which boldly states that Col. Roosevelt and his friends entered into a conspiracy, first to steal the nomination and then to buy it. I want to submit here as evidence an affidavit of a colored minister to prove that Roosevelt and his friends were trying to buy the nomination. Everybody at the Chicago Convention knows that this was true. They know that there were millions behind Col. Roosevelt. They know that Roosevelt's friends made the boast that they would have the convention at any cost. They also know that the scheme was to buy a few crooked delegates on every delegation possible and after they had secured enough to give them control of the convention then at the psychological moment the great moral reformer was to perform his stunt of stampeding the convention and the stampede was to be led by the purchased delegates, who were to break away from their delegations and with righteous proclamations declare for Roosevelt. Upon this point I want to submit the following facts from the New York *Times* of June 18th, 1912. All of the other papers

published the same information. The statement in the New York *Times* is as follows:

MORE NEGROES TELL OF BRIBE OFFERS

MAKE AFFIDAVIT THAT BOLTER TO ROOSEVELT OFFERED THEM MONEY TO JOIN HIM

On the eve of the opening of the Republican National Convention, where the first test of strength between the followers of President Taft and Col. Roosevelt is bound to come, the Taft campaign managers are receiving additional evidence that the promoters of the Roosevelt boom are seeking to buy the Presidential nomination for the Colonel by corrupting negro delegates from the South.

The disclosures which have been made in this connection have already aroused the entire country. To-night two affidavits were given out, one of these from a minister of the Gospel, who declared that he had been approached by Charles S. Banks, the Mississippi negro delegate whose name has figured so conspicuously in earlier disclosures, alleging corruption or attempt at corruption of negro delegates pledged to President Taft by agents of the Roosevelt boom.

The first of the affidavits was made by the Rev. James W. Shumport, D. D., Presiding Elder in the Meridian, Miss., Methodist Episcopal Church Conference. Dr. Shumport is a delegate to the convention. Here is his affidavit:

> STATE OF ILLINOIS, City of Chicago, ss.:
>
> On Thursday, June 13, 1912, at the Coliseum in the City of Chicago, Ill., I was met by Charles Banks of Mississippi, and a delegate from that State to the Republican National Convention, who asked me to call at his house, 2959 Wabash Avenue, Chicago. I went to his house at 5 o'clock the same afternoon, and when I entered his room he asked everybody to leave except me. He began the conversation by asking me if I had ever seen a thousand-dollar bill. I replied that I had not. He then put his hand in his pocket and brought out a big roll of bills. The outside bill was one of the denomination of $1,000. It was the first I had ever seen. The roll of bills was nearly all gold certificates.
>
> He then wanted to know how much I would ask to go with him and support Mr. Roosevelt. I told him I would not be bought; that I had not come to Chicago to sell myself. He then said that all or a majority of the delegates were going to Roosevelt, who would be nominated, and that Mr. Roosevelt would make him the referee in Mississippi in connection with all the Federal offices. I repeated

that I would not be a party to such a transaction, and then excused myself. There was no further conversation between us.

Dated this seventeenth day of June, 1912.

J. M. SHUMPORT,
Presiding Elder Meridian Conference M. E. Church.

Witnesseth: ANDREW GEDDES,
J. T. MONTGOMERY.

Subscribed and sworn to before me, a Notary Public, June 17th, 1912.

M. BELLE CARNAHAN,
Notary Public.

A similar affidavit, executed by A. Buckley, also a negro delegate from Mississippi, charges that Banks offered him $300 to "switch."

—New York Times, June 18, 1912.

ROOSEVELT AS A PROGRESSIVE

Colonel Roosevelt is the greatest reactionary that has ever appeared in American politics.

He stands for the initiative, the referendum, the recall and the overthrow of the American constitution.

He stands for the destruction of our modern American system of representative government, which is the best and most progressive government in the world.

He stands for the recall of judicial decisions, for making the confusion of the multitude the final interpreter of the law, and the passion of the populace the final arbiter of justice. In this enlightened age he wants to restore the kind of a court that sentenced Christ to the cross.

He stands for every heresy of Populism and of Socialism. He stands for a "pure democracy," which is the oldest and most primitive form of government known to man. He is trying to carry us back to the diseases, disorders and deformities of the primitive political state.

He stands for the rule of the people by ignorant impulse and blind hysteria instead of by reason, judgment and common sense.

He thinks the way to be a progressive is to make "secret deals" with the trusts to finance his political campaigns and then hurl fiery words and phrases into the air and fill the heavens with noise to attract attention and fool the people into believing that his words are deeds.

Roosevelt stands for the government fixing prices on commodities. So does the Steel Trust, providing Roosevelt is the government. In this he is again the great reactionary.

He wants to carry us back to the time when the kings fixed the prices on commodities. Back to industrial barbarism. We find in the industrial dark ages large numbers of statutes, which put restrictions of every kind on the freedom of the individual citizen; but especially on his right to choose his own field of labor and his right to make his own prices for his labor and merchandise.

Statutes after statutes were passed upon this subject. The prices were fixed on all kinds of commodities and labor, and the

result was commercial paralysis, political chaos and social disorder.

Extra sessions of legislatures had to be called to repeal these idiotic statutes and special decrees had to be put in force to relieve the people from the bondage of these absurd and unworkable laws. Roosevelt, the real reactionary, wants to carry us back in this country to those industrial days. Even the pilgrims when they first landed in Boston tried out these wild theories and raw methods. They fixed prices on labor and commodities. At this time in Boston it was ordered that

> The carpenters, joiners, bricklayers, sawers and thatchers should not take above two shillings a day, nor any man should give more, under pain of ten shillings to taker and giver

and "sawers" were restricted as to prices they might take for "boards."

Roosevelt advocates all these old reactionary policies and is trying to carry us back to the doctrines that originated in the industrial dark ages, while posing before the country as the champion Progressive.

In his work entitled "State Control," Albert Stickney, when reciting these old English statutes and similar statutes in this country, discussing their final repeal, says:

> Experience shows, in times recent as well as ancient, that any attempt to interfere by legislation, or by the arm of the law, with the citizen's full freedom of contract, in fixing the price of his own labor or merchandise, either singly or in combination with others, is wholly needless, and is productive only of evil.—State Control, Page 5.

Continuing this discussion and summing up his conclusions as to the impracticability and the impossibility of the government fixing prices, Stickney says:

> All human experience thus far conclusively demonstrates that the accomplishment of this end must be left to the parties interested in each separate transaction of sale, the buyer and the seller. They know, and they alone know, the facts which properly enter into the decision of all questions of price. In the decision of every question of price there are always two controlling elements: they are (1) the needs of the buyer, and (2) the needs of the seller. Those two elements determine

> the question of price—and determine it conclusively—in every transaction of sale. Those two elements can be justly estimated by only two persons in the whole world—the high contracting parties. They are the only persons who are in a position to weigh those two elements. It is to the interest of every one, of the buyer, of the seller, and of "the public," that the decision of these questions of value and price shall be left to the parties to the transaction, and that, in making that decision, those two parties shall have the fullest contractual freedom.—"State Control," Page 145.

The American people should begin to read history, they should begin to enlighten themselves, they should cease to follow the Cleons of our day. The Roosevelts have existed in all ages, they are as old as selfishness and perverted ambition. Away back in Athens they had a pure democracy and they had Roosevelts in that day, who posed as the only friends of the people. Aristotle describes one of them as follows:

> After the death of Pericles, Nicias, who subsequently fell in Sicily, appeared as leader of the aristocracy, and Cleon as that of the people. The latter seems more than anyone else, to have been the cause of the corruption of the democracy by his wild undertakings; and he was the first to use unseemly shouting and coarse abuse on the Bema (platform) and to harangue the people with his coat girt up short about him, whereas all his predecessors had spoken decently and in order.

Roosevelt, the fake-seller, is the prototype of Cleon, the leather-seller.

Aristotle, in discussing the demagogues of that time, refers to two of them as follows:

> Both of these persons were subsequently condemned to death; for the people, even if they are deceived for a time, in the end generally come to detest those who have beguiled them into any unworthy action. After Cleophon the popular leadership was occupied successively by the men who chose to talk the biggest and pander the most to the tastes of the majority, with their eyes fixed only on the interests of the moment.—Aristotle in Athenian Constitution, Page 53.

What a vivid picture of our modern Demagogues!

TAFT AS A PROGRESSIVE

President Taft stands for his country and its flag, for the constitution and the courts, for liberty regulated by law.

He stands for an adequate army and an efficient navy. He stands for protection to American industries, to the American farmers and to the American workingman. He stands against populism and socialism, against that progressiveness which progresses backward to a pure democracy, which would carry us back to that political midnight, which preceded the dawn of the American Republic.

He stands against the initiative, the referendum and the recall, because he knows that these fallacies are as old as human history and were conceived in ignorance of the science of government and of politics, and were born in the throes of hysteria and tumult. They were all tried out and condemned ages ago and were discarded by enlightened statesmanship and advancing civilization.

He stands against social disorder, political chaos and civic anarchy.

He believes in the rule of the people by ripe deliberation and right reason.

He thinks the way to be a progressive is to secure the enactment of constructive legislation and vigorously enforce the laws of the land against big and little trusts alike and then restore business stability and prosperity, all of which he has splendidly done.

President Taft is the most sane, consistent and safe progressive in this country and the American people should stand by him and support him.

I wish to call your attention to an eminent authority upon this point. In speaking of William Howard Taft, the late Republican, Col. Theodore Roosevelt, in a letter to Conrad Cohrs used these emphatic words:

> The true friend of reform, the true foe of abuse, is the man who steadily perseveres in righting wrongs, but whose character and training are such that he never

> promises what he cannot perform, that he always, a little more than makes good, by what he does promise and that, while steadily advancing, he never permits himself to be led into foolish excesses, which would damage the very cause he champions. **In Mr. Taft we have a man who combines all these qualifications to a degree which no other man in our public life, since the Civil War, has surpassed.**

This is the tribute paid to William Howard Taft by Col. Theodore Roosevelt, when Roosevelt's mind was clear, his reason sound, his heart honest and when his ambition for a third term had not yet prostituted his judgment.

WOODROW WILSON

Governor Woodrow Wilson, the Democratic candidate for president, is a college professor, an impractical theorist, and he has had no experience in statecraft or public affairs. He is a free trader by nature, instinct and education. He was born in the State of Virginia, where in his early years he imbibed the free trade atmosphere of the South, and then he entered the school room, where theories that will not work are prolific.

He has had a great deal to say about the tariff in this campaign, but his ignorance of the subject is lamentable. For instance, in one of his speches he said that meat was selling in New York for 29 cents per pound and in London for 20 cents per pound and that the difference of 9 cents per pound between New York and London was caused by the tariff on meat. This college professor did not seem to know that the tariff on meat is only 1½ cents per pound, and if he had told the people this it would have been rather difficult for him to explain how a tariff of 1½ cents per pound could raise the price of meat 9 cents per pound. Do you not see how easy it is for a simple fact to make a fool of a college professor's theory?

JOB E. HEDGES

Job E. Hedges, the Republican candidate for governor, is a prominent and successful lawyer, an able, broad-minded business man, who has demonstrated his executive capacity and his fitness to discharge the responsible duties of governor.

Mr. Hedges is a student of the science of government and of politics, is well versed in history, is acquainted with all the theories of government, past and present, and has the intelligence and sound judgment to accept what is good and reject what is false and unsound. Therefore, he is admirably equipped by knowledge, by experience and ability to make one of the best governors the State of New York has ever had.

WILLIAM SULZER

Mr. Sulzer, the Democratic candidate for governor, has had an honorable and somewhat prominent public career as Speaker

of the Assembly, as leader of the Democratic minority in that body and as congressman, but he is an active member of Tammany Hall and has been for the past twenty-two years, and if elected governor he will be the first Tammany governor the state has had in a half century.

Gov. Dix was an upstate man who was not a member of Tammany Hall and yet everybody knows that he surrendered to the dictation of Tammany Hall and Tammany has been conducting the government at Albany for the past two years. Could the people expect anything better from Sulzer, who is a member of the Tammany organization? To expect Sulzer to break away from Tammany and its influences when his future advancement would depend upon that organization's support is extremely absurd.

OSCAR S. STRAUS

The Hon. Oscar S. Straus, the Bull Moose candidate for governor, is the Tallyrand of American politics. He served as Minister to Turkey under President Cleveland, a Democratic president, and he served in the cabinet of President Roosevelt, a Republican president, and he applied for a position under President Taft and was "turned down," and that is the reason he is now the Bull Moose candidate for governor.

Mr. Straus seems to have no fixed political principles or permanent convictions and he is ready to accept office from the hands of any party or any aggregation of citizens, without regard to whether they are Democrats, Republicans or Bull Moose. To obtain an office seems to be his highest ambition. Honor is his goal and he cares not from whom it comes.

Mr. Straus says that he is the candidate of the "peepul;" that his only boss will be the "peepul." This sounds fine and it has been the favorite argument of the demagogue ever since he emerged from the cave. Let us see what Mr. Straus really thinks of the people and how competent he thinks they are to conduct the government and manage its affairs.

Speaking of the Hebrew Commonwealth in his book written some time ago, when he was not a candidate for office and when he was not trying to flatter and fool the people, Mr. Straus said:

> **The lessons of the decline of this republic are as valuable and instructive as that of its development. It**

> was not subverted by force nor by the tricks or cunning devices of unscrupulous leaders, but by the people exercising their democratic prerogative, the right of choice to set up over themselves such form of government as they might elect.—Straus, Hebrew Commonwealth, Page 116.

This Bull Moose candidate for governor, having left the Democratic party, then the Republican party, and having now espoused the cause of the Bull Moose party, stands on its crazy-quilt platform, and has turned his back upon all of his past teachings and is now coursing after "strange gods." In proof of this we quote from Mr. Straus as follows:

> History is to a nation what experience is to an individual, and just as a wise man will guide himself by "the lamp" of experience, so will a patriotic people run not after strange gods, but will direct their course under the guidance of the philosophy of their own past.—Straus on Roger Williams, Page 215.

Straus is now following the "golden calf of temporary expediency," but in his book, speaking of the importance of the stability and permanence of governmental policies, he says:

> Let us have a care that we do not in the years of our prosperity prostrate ourselves before the golden calf of temporary expediency, and through false lights violate the universal principles of justice and liberty underlying our American institutions.—Straus on Roger Williams, Pages 2-5.

Mr. Straus is going up and down the state telling what he will do if the people will elect him governor. Among other things he says that if the people will make him governor, he will

> Stamp out tuberculosis in the State of New York.

Think of it. Here is a candidate for public office who goes out before the people and as an inducement for their votes he promises that if they will elect him to a public office, he will perform the miracles of Christ and heal the sick.

If Mr. Straus had been nominated for president instead of governor, he would then have gone up and down the country promising the voters that if they would only elect him president he would *raise the dead* and give us all the blessed privilege of having a *reunion here on earth with our departed friends.*

Is it not time that an intelligent public laughed such moving picture statesmen off the stage?

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

The Republican party was born in a struggle for human freedom and was the child of the enlightened conscience of the nation.

It was rocked in the cradle of patriotism and nursed to position and power by the eternal principles of right and justice. The Republican party's first great achievement was the preservation of the Union, by the suppression of secession and treason. The Republican party's next great achievement was the extension of freedom and the franchise to 4,000,000 slaves. Since that time the Republican party's achievements have been the recorded achievements of our common country.

The Republican party is the party of Liberty; it is the party of Honest Money; it is the party of an Honest Ballot.

Liberty is the heart of this Republic; honest money is the blood that courses through its veins, and an honest ballot is its breath of life.

Remove from the pages of history the achievements of the Republican party for the last half century and there would be but little left to shed luster and glory on the American name.

The Republican party with such a record, the party which has been the greatest human agency the world has ever known for the promotion of the cause of good government, the development of industrial progress and the advancement of civilization, during the past fifty years, can never be destroyed by a disappointed political demagogue marching under the banner of party treason. Let me call your attention to an eminent authority on this subject. *Harper's Weekly,* one of the most influential journals of high standing in this country, which is supporting Governor Wilson, the Democratic nominee for president, in a recent editorial, commenting upon the political situation, said:

> **The Republican party is not dead. Though seemingly sleeping for the moment, it will soon be as wide awake and determined to win as ever before in its successful career. And it is still the strongest, most compact, best equipped and most skillfully directed political organization the world has ever known.**

The Republican party may be temporarily divided by the

influence of Roosevelt, a former president, who owes all his prominence, power and prestige to the Republican party, but this apostate will never be able to kill that party, he will only succeed in killing his own name in history.

The party of Lincoln and Seward, Grant and Conkling, Blaine and Garfield, Arthur and Hoar, Harrison and Hale, McKinley and Reed, Black and Root, Lodge and Taft will continue to live and prosper, and it will continue to have the support of the heart, brain and conscience of the American people, long after the hysteria and confusion of the hour have passed away. The party which has written every important page in American history since the Civil War will continue to live, and notwithstanding the noise of the demagogues, and the bellowing of the "Big Bull Moose," the political wrecks—the disloyal wrecks—strewn along the political highway, from VanBuren and Greeley, down to date, all bear eloquent and conclusive testimony to the fact that in this moral, this civilized, this enlightened age, party *treason* has not yet become a *virtue* and party *loyalty* has not yet become a *crime,* and they never will become so, as long as reason is the torch that lights and patriotism is the motive that moves mankind to political action.

REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT

The Ancients had never discovered a workable system of government between the *extremes* of a pure democracy which was a *failure* and an aristocracy or a monarchy, both of which curtailed individual liberty and deprived the great mass of the people of a controlling voice in the affairs of their government.

> All the authorities appear to be agreed that there is no prototype for what seems to us such a very simple thing as representation, representative government, among the Greeks or the Romans, or any of the older civilizations of which we have knowledge.—Stimson, Popular Law-Making, Page 5.

The statesmen who founded the American Republic were the first practical exponents and founders of a free representative democracy, which has proved its adaptability to any and every extent of territory and population, and which at the same time, guards and protects individual liberty and gives the people a controlling voice in the affairs of their government.

Madison laid down the accurate law of representation in a democracy when he said:

> The representation should be large enough to guard against the cabals of the few and small enough to guard against the confusion of the multitude.

The founders of the republic having the wisdom and experience of all the ages to guide them, knew that a pure democracy had neither stability nor reliability, because it gave a free rein to the emotions and passions of men. They knew that an aristocracy and a monarchy had stability and reliability but was a tyranny, and so they aimed to found a government which had all the good features of a democracy, which left the final control of the government in the hands of the people, but which at the same time possessed the efficiency and stability of a monarchy, and so they planned to make the people themselves the monarch, with certain necessary checks, balances and limitations, the same to be fixed in a written constitution. They said in effect:

> We will engraft representation upon democracy and thereby we will arrive at a system of stable government

> capable of embracing and confederating all the various interests of society and every extent of territory and population. By having the people in every section elect representatives to a legislature or a convention, we thus provide by secondary means a common center where all the parts of society can unite and concentrate the experience, energy and wisdom necessary to the interests of the parts and of the whole. And thereby we place the government in a constant state of order and maturity.

This is the central idea of our American representative system of government, and it has been the best form of government and has proved the greatest success of any government ever instituted among men. The framers of our system of government knew that the people in every locality, in small civil divisions like towns and wards, could easily select the best men for public office because they would choose them from their friends, neighbors and prominent citizens. They realized that in this way they could pick out men of character and ability, whose fitness for the offices which they sought would be known to every voter in the community. Therefore, they knew that the people would have within easy reach the necessary information in regard to candidates, as to their standing and ability and their qualifications, and by having this personal knowledge they could intelligently select, in their immediate community, the best men for public office. But they knew that when the territory within which the people were called upon to act was extended beyond the small civil divisions of a town or a ward, that when the territory was extended beyond the personal acquaintances of the voters and the candidates appear beyond that sphere for public offices, then the voters would be *deprived of this intimate personal knowledge and acquaintance and the necessary occurate information,* and therefore they would be obliged to *guess* at the qualifications of the candidates. In order to remedy this defect, in order to overcome this weakness, which had led to the *ruin* of all the ancient democracies, the American statesmen added the feature of representation to a democracy. They said in effect:

> The people can select local officers intelligently, wisely and well, and therefore they can select local representatives in the same way, and so we will provide a system of representation, which will allow the people to select representatives in their own immediate vicinity from among their best and most prominent

citizens, who are best qualified by ability and experience to act for the people beyond the sphere, beyond the territory, where they can obtain the necessary, reliable and correct information to act for themselves and by doing this we will enable the people to pick out men of experience, character, wisdom and statesmanship, wherever they can be found, and center them in a representative body, a legislature or convention, where they can act for the public good.

Upon this point Madison, speaking of our representative republic, said:

The two great points of difference between a Democracy and a Republic are:

First, the delegation of the government, in the latter, to a small number of citizens elected by the rest; secondly, the greater sphere of country over which the latter may be extended.

The effect of the first difference is, on the one hand, to refine and enlarge the public views by passing them through the medium of a choice body of citizens, whose wisdom may best discern the true interests of their country, and whose patriotism and love of justice will least likely sacrifice it to temporary or partial consideration. Under such a regulation, it may well happen that the public voice, pronounced by the representatives of the people, will be more consonant to the public good than if pronounced by the people themselves, convened for that purpose.—The Federalist, Letter X.

Writing upon the same subject, Jefferson said:

For let it be agreed that a government is Republican in proportion as every member composing it has equal voice in the direction of its concerns (not indeed in person, which would be impracticable beyond the limits of a city or a small township), but by representatives chosen by himself and responsible to him at short periods, and let us bring to the test of this canon every branch of our constitution.—Works, Vol. 15, Page 33.

And again Jefferson said:

I have stated that the constitutions of our several states vary more or less in some particulars, but there are certain principles in which all agree, and which all cherish as vitally essential to the protection of life, liberty, property and safety of the citizen.

1. Freedom of religion, restricted only from acts of trespass on that of others.

2. Freedom of person, securing every one from imprisonment or other bodily restraint, but by the laws of the land.

3. Trial by jury, the best of all safeguards for the person, the property and the fame of every individual.

4. **The exclusive right of legislation and taxation in the representatives of the people.**—Works, Vol. 15, Page 489.

Writing upon the same subject Jay said:

Nothing can be more fallacious than to found our political calculations on arithmetical principles. Sixty or seventy men may be more properly trusted with a given degree of power than six or seven. But it does not follow that 600 or 700 would be proportionately a better depository. And if we carry on the supposition to 6,000 or 7,000 the whole reasoning ought to be reversed. The truth is that in all cases a certain number at least seems to be necessary to secure the benefits of free consultation and discussion, and to guard against too easy a combination for improper purposes; as, on the other hand, the number ought at most to be kept within a certain limit in order to avoid the confusion and intemperance of the multitude. **In all very numerous assemblies, of whatever character composed, passion never fails to wrest the scepter from reason. Had every Athenian citizen been a Socrates, every Athenian assembly would still have been a mob.**—Federalist, Letter LIV.

Thus was Roosevelt's theory of a pure democracy examined and discussed in the light of history and experience, and condemned and discarded by Madison, Jefferson and Jay, as well as by all the other statesmen, when they founded this government and framed the Federal Constitution. Therefore, Roosevelt, in advocating a pure democracy, is progressing backward to that political *midnight* which preceded the dawn of the American Republic.

I am aware that Jefferson is represented as being the champion of democracy and it is constantly asserted that he favored a pure democracy. Nothing could be further from the truth. He favored the American system of Representative Democracy. Those who represent Jefferson as believing in a pure or direct democracy, such as is advocated by Roosevelt and others today, are woefully ignorant of the teachings of Jefferson.

I have already quoted from Jefferson, to the effect that it

is impracticable for the people to act directly beyond the limits of a "small township." I have again quoted Jefferson as declaring that the feature of a representative democracy is that it places:

> The exclusive right of legislation and taxation in the representatives of the people.

I wish to again quote Jefferson as follows:

> That majority, then, has a right to depute representatives, to the convention. and to make the constitution what they think will be the best for themselves. But how collect their voice? This is the real difficulty. If invited by private authority, or country or district meetings, these divisions are so large that few will attend; and their voice will be imperfectly or falsely pronounced.

Jefferson and Hamilton represented two different schools of statesmenship but it is well understood by informed students of our political history that they both agreed as to the impracticability of and the failure of a pure democracy and that they both advocated a representative republic as the cure for the evils of direct mass action. Again Jefferson said:

> The government of Athens, for example, was that of the people of one city making laws for the whole country subject to them. * * * These are not the doctrines of the present age. The equal rights of man, and the happiness of every individual, are now acknowledged to be the only legitimate objects of government. Modern times have the signal advantage, too, of having discovered the only device by which these rights can be secured, to wit: government by the people, acting not in person, but by representatives chosen by themselves; that is to say, by every man of ripe years and sound mind, who either contributes by his purse or person to the support of his country.—Vol. 15, Page 482.

Then again speaking of the Ancients Jefferson said:

> They knew no medium between a democracy (the only pure Republic, but impractical beyond the limits of a town) and an abandonment of themselves to an aristocracy or a tyranny independent of the people. It seems not to have occurred that where the citzens cannot meet to transact their business in person, they alone have the right to choose the agents who shall transact it, and that in this way a Republican or popular government of the second grade of purity may be exercised over any extent of

country. The full experiment of a government democratical, but representative, was and still is reserved for us.

Thus it will be observed that Jefferson was a firm believer in the representative feature of our American system of government and that he argued with great force and unanswerable logic against a pure democracy, stating that it was impracticable beyond the "limits of a town," and yet this is the kind of democracy now being advocated by our modern shallow demagogues, who see in such advocacy an opportunity to flatter and fool the people. "Direct legislation" and "direct nominations" and the hypocritical cant about "the rule of the people" like the advocacy of "free and unlimited coinage of silver" and "greenbackism"—the making of money by law, instead of working for it—and all the other countless political fallacies and *catch phrases* of this character are only used by demagogues in an attempt to flatter, mislead and fool the people and obtain their votes for a public office, and those who resort to these arts are not the friends of the people but they are a menace to good government and to real progress.

These political "fads" relative to the direct action of the people en masse are fallacies, which were tried out and proved failures ages ago and they have been condemned in the light of universal history and experience and by the enlightened statesmanship of the civilized world and the attempt to revive them now, in this country, is a step backward. It is retrogression. It is a species of political atavism, which clearly indicates the approaching decline and decay of the American nation, unless the movement can be headed off by educating the people so that they will reject these quack political nostrums and stand firm for our modern enlightened system of representative democracy, which has resulted in making this country the greatest nation in the world.

The only evidence we now have that we are really politically diseased is the fact that we have produced a Roosevelt, a La Follette and a Debs. They are the cancers on the fair face of our body politic. They are the malignant growths that are infusing socialistic poison into the heart and brain of the public and endangering the life of our representative institutions.

I wish right here to call your attention to the fact that I stated in the beginning of my remarks that our modern office-

seeking demagogues do not study philisopny or statesmenship but that they read only yellow journals and muck-raking magazines. The proof of it is to be found, among other things, in their ignorance of the teachings of Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence. They probably have never read his works, but if they have, it is evident that they lack comprehension.

I want to take this opportunity to warn you, for your own interest, against giving these demagogues your confidence and support. The time has come when in order to protect and preserve your country's representative institutions and its constitution, you should begin to turn your attention to a study of your government and transfer your allegiance from demagogues to statesmen. Let me remind you that both history and experience teach us with unerring accuracy that there is only one short step between the "Demagogue and the Despot."

THE CONSTITUTION

The American Constitution was framed by the greatest statesmen ever assembled at a given time to found a government.

The great English statesman, Gladstone, speaking of the American Constitution, said:

> It is the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man.

We have been progressing so fast in this country, we have been giving so much attention to industrial development and the building up of our great and glorious country and providing conveniences and comforts for ourselves and families that we have not given much time to the study of our government and we have ceased to familiarize ourselves with the constitution.

How many of you have given any attention and thought and study to our American system of representative government, and to a study of the constitution, which contains the guarantees of your personal rights and liberties? It is safe to say that most of you have had your minds so occupied with the business affairs of life that you have neglected to give this subject any study or serious thought and careful consideration. This is not so strange, because not until recently has such thought, study and consideration been necessary. Not until recently has anybody in this country had the audacity to attack the virtues of our constitution and our American system of representative government.

The first to make that attack was the Populist of the West, a few years ago. The Populist party came with a great noise, but it quietly died last summer when in the parlor of a Chicago hotel only eight delegates met to hold its national convention. The party is a memory, but its doctrines still flourish. They have been taken up by the Socialist party and by the demagogues, who call themselves insurgents in both parties and by the yellow journals. They have all been embraced now by the Bull Moose party. The result is that the Populist's original attack upon the constitution and upon our form of representative government is making considerable headway in many of the states. The manifestation of this Populistic movement is witnessed in direct primary nomina-

tions, the initative, the referendum and the recall, all of which have been adopted in some states and are being agitated in many others. The most conspicuous champion at the present time of these old, discarded and age-worn fallacies is Colonel Theodore Roosevelt. He is prominent on account of the fact that he has been president of the United States, and such prominence together with his natural ability gives him a wide influence. He has now become a menace to the American system of government and to the American Constitution. Therefore, I wish to call your attention to the importance of maintaining our constitution, for the purpose of preserving your own individual rights and liberties.

The one supreme issue in this campaign is the maintenance of our representative institutions and of the federal constitution. This issue transcends in importance all other issues, both state and national.

Colonel Roosevelt, by his advocacy of the recall of judicial decisions, proposes to make the constitution a nullity and break down its guarantees to life, liberty and property and leave our rights and liberties, not protected by a written constitution but he proposes to submit them to the temporary whims of the community by having them passed upon by a majority vote. He holds that court decisions should be recalled by a majority vote and that such decisions should be the law, instead of the decisions of the courts. I wish to invite your attention to the first provision of the Bill of Rights, in the constitution, which reads as follows:

> **Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people to peaceably assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.—Art. 1 of the Bill of Rights.**

This provision of the constitution guarantees to every one the right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. No congress can take this right away from you. No majority can take this right away from you, in any community or in any state in the Union, because the people in their sovereign capacity, by this compact in the constitution, have recognized this right as a personal and inalienable right, which cannot be infringed upon by anybody, not by a majority of the voters, not by

any state legislature or by the Congress of the United States. And the people have established courts of justice to see to it that these individual rights and liberties shall be enforced so that each person in this country shall have the right, unmolested, to worship God in accordance with the dictates of his own conscienec.

Remove this constitutional guaranty and what becomes of this individual religious liberty? Remove the courts and how can the individual enforce his rights to such liberty? By leaving it to a majority? Suppose a majority are Presbyterians and they say the Methodists cannot worship. Suppose a majority are Baptists and they say the Catholics cannot worship. What becomes of your religious liberties? Have we so soon forgotten that religious persecution kept the horizon lurid with the fagot's flame for thousand years? Is there an intelligent man or woman in this audience who wants to submit their right to worship God in accordance with the dictates of their conscience to a majority vote? This is what Colonel Roosevelt's proposal leads to and he calls it progress. He is mistaken, and it is not the first time. Let me call your attention to another provision in the Bill of Rights, in our constitution. It reads as follows:

> **The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses papers and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrant shall issue but upon probable causes, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized.—Art. IV of the Bill of Rights.**

In this provision of the constitution, every person is protected against illegal and unlawful interference. He cannot be molested in his person or property or deprived of his effects without it being done in the legal manner, prescribed by law. If any person's rights are thus infringed upon, he can appeal to the courts and have his rights enforced.

Let me call your attention to the fact that a constitution is a contract which society makes with the individual and with the minority, when society is calm, sober and intelligent and when reason and justice guides its action. This contract is made to protect the individual and the minority against the power of the majority when it is drunk with passion, frenzy and hate, and when in this state of

mind it might temporarily outrage the rights of the minority and of the individual. It is when society is in this latter condition, however, that Colonel Roosevelt proposes to submit for its consideration court decisions. What a monstrous proposition! Do you want to leave the determination of your religious liberty, the safety of your home, your property, your life, to a majority vote of any community? Could not a few demagogues financed with rich men's money carry the majority vote and take your property, your home and your life, if you were a poor man and unable to defend yourself? And right here I wish to call your attention to the fact that a constitution is necessary for the protection of the poor and weak. The rich can take care of themselves and so can the majority, therefore a constitution is formed especially for the purpose of protecting the weak, the defenseless and the poor. Lord Brougham expressed this powerfully and beautifully when he said:

> It was the boast of Augustus,—it formed part of the glare in which the perfidies of his earlier years were lost, —that he found Rome of brick and left it of marble. But how much nobler will be the sovereign's boast when he shall have it to say, that he found law dear and left it cheap; found it a sealed book, left it a living letter; found it the patrimony of the rich, left it the inheritance of the poor; found it the two-edged sword of craft and oppression, left it the staff of honesty and the shield of innocence.

I wish to invite your attention to another provision in the constitution, which relates to your individual rights. It is as follows:

> No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime unless on presentment of indictment by a grand jury. Nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life and limb, nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.

This provision of the constitution protects every one of you against the legislatures of the land and against every majority in every community, and every state and against the congress as well, and if an attempt is made to deprive you of your life, liberty or property without "due process of law," you can appeal to the courts

for redress and the courts, in accordance with the mandate of the people, in their written constitution, will enforce your rights. But Roosevelt proposes to turn your rights over to the whim of a mere majority, which in three days may become the minority. Can you think of anything more monstrous? Can you think of a more ideal state of political anarchy?

Do you not see that this doctrine of the recall of judicial decisions leads not only to social suicide, but to political anarchy, and yet Roosevelt calls it "social justice." Could anything be more unjust, more atrocious than to leave the security of your life and property subject to the raid of a majority moved by emotion and inflamed by passion, and provide for you no refuge in which to seek safety and protection? Do you not see that this invokes the old barbaric rule that "Might Makes Right?"

I had supposed that we had advanced along the highway of progress and civilization, until we had finally reached that enlightened state where "Right Makes Might," but Colonel Roosevelt wants to carry us back to the barbaric days when the maxim was "Might Makes Right," back to the days of the inquisition, the thumb-screw, the instruments of torture and the fagot's flame! Roosevelt calls himself a Progressive. He is progressing more rapidly than the crab, and in the same direction!

I want to impress upon your minds the importance of having a government of law. I want to warn you against the danger of attaching your faith to a personality. When we place our faith in principles which are eternal, we have, forever a resting place for our faith. When we give our allegiance to well settled governmental and political policies advocated by a political party we also have the same security because "while men may come and men may go, parties and policies go on forever." On the contrary when you put your faith in a single individual, when you blindly attach your faith to a personality and that person goes wrong, you go with him and the inevitable result is you soon awaken and find yourself stranded in a wilderness of disappointment.

Aristotle, one of the greatest philosophers of all the ages and the founder of political science, said:

> He who bids the law rule may be deemed to bid God and Reason alone rule, but he who bids man rule adds an element of the beast, for desire is a wild beast and passion

> perverts the minds of rulers even when they are the best of men. Law is reason unaffected by desire.

Let me repeat this last sentence. I want to impress it upon your minds.

> Law is reason unaffected by desire.

Aristotle knew as we know that law, unlike man, never becomes perverted by passion and never becomes a wild beast, and that is the reason that we must have government by law, instead of government by men. He who advocates a policy, which aims to break down a government by a written constitution is an enemy to his country and the foe of law, order and religious liberty.

Colonel Roosevelt in advocating the recall of judicial decisions by a majority vote has become an evil genius, who with ruthless hands is trying to pull down the pillars of the Republic. The recall of judicial decisions by a majority vote is the most treasonable and dangerous doctrine ever proposed in this country since secession reared its ugly head in an effort to dismember the Union. The man who tries to undermine the people's confidence in our courts of justice is an enemy to his country. There is no place on earth, since the dawn of civilization, where the sacred Goddesses of liberty and justice have so often met in fond embrace as under the impartial folds of the ermine of an independent and fearless judiciary. Speaking of the United States Supreme Court, Horace Binney said:

> What, sir, is the Supreme Court of the United States? It is the august representative of the wisdom and justice and conscience of this whole people, in the exposition of their constitution and laws. It is the peaceful and venerable arbitrator between the citizens in all questions touching the extent and sway of constitutional power. It is the great moral substitute for force in the controversies between the people, the States and the Union.

Remove the constitution, which is the crystalized conscience of the people and which is "Reason unaffected by desire," and then remove the courts and you have removed all the safeguards of society and all the protection to life, liberty and property and you have ushered in the reign of political chaos and anarchy, to be followed by the man on horseback and the "reign of terror."

In his fevered imagination the Rough-Rider is already on the way; the Robespierres are Ready to Rise; the keen eye of the student of history can already detect the blood of revolution on the moon

and the only safety to this Republic lies in administering a crushing defeat on Tuesday next to Theodore Roosevelt who thirsts for the fame of a Caesar and a Napoleon in violation of his solemn pledge to the American people and in violation of the historic precedents of his country.

We are on the eve of a revolution created by the ceaseless agitation of office-seeking demagogues in spite of our unparalleled prosperity. This country is facing the greatest crisis since the Civil War. Our representative institutions are in danger. Treason is gnawing at the heart of our Constitution.

In this crisis it is just as important that every patriot should respond to the defense of our representative institutions and fight for the preservation of our constitution as it was for them to rush to the defense of the Union when it was attacked by secession and treason. The danger of the present is as great as the danger of the past. It is not so apparent to the average citizen, but it is just as apparent to the student of history. It will require all the intelligence, the patience and the wisdom of the American people together with the highest statesmanship of our country to solve the great problem which now confronts us.

Government founded on law, order, stability and progress will be supported by every patriot, but government by hysteria, tumult and anarchy will be supported by every office-seeking demagogue. The demand of the hour is:

"God give us men; a time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor,—men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagogue,
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking!
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty and in private thinking."

Such a man, my friends, is President William Howard Taft!

BETTS-ROOSEVELT LETTERS

A Spirited and Illuminating Discussion of

A PURE DEMOCRACY
DIRECT NOMINATIONS
THE INITIATIVE
THE REFERENDUM and
THE RECALL

Together with a discussion of Constitutional limitations and the Court of Appeals' decision in the Workmen's Compensation Case

In writing of the BETTS-ROOSEVELT LETTERS, former minister to Germany, Hon. Andrew D. White, says:

"I can recall no general treatment of political questions in recent years which seems to me more likely to influence public opinion healthfully."

Price postpaid, handsomely bound in cloth, $1.00, in paper, 50 cents

---

PUBLISHED BY

The Lyons Republican Co.

41 William St., LYONS, N. Y.

THE NAKED TRUTH

The Mask Stripped from Demagogues and the Facts Revealed

The Heart and Brain of Humbug Pierced by the Sword of Truth

Vital Issues Before the Country Clearly Analyzed and Discussed

Among the Subjects are:

PRESENT DISCONTENT
CHICAGO CONTESTS
CANADIAN RECIPROCITY
THE TARIFF
THE FARMER AND THE TARIFF
THE WORKINGMAN AND THE TARIFF
ROOSEVELT AND THE TRUSTS
ROOSEVELT AS A PROGRESSIVE
TAFT AS A PROGRESSIVE
THE REPUBLICAN PARTY
REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT
THE CONSTITUTION

Speech delivered by CHARLES H. BETTS, editor of The Lyons Republican, at Clyde, N. Y., Nov. 2d, 1912.

Price 25 Cents. Discount in Quantities

PUBLISHED BY

The Lyons Republican Co.

LYONS, NEW YORK

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 013 982 445 3